

Or how easy in the case of another group to select commodities that have for several years been tending downward and construct a wholesale commodity price index that will show over a series of years a general decline, and from this group of 400—over half the commodities carried by the Bureau for the months indicated—which showed no change, how easy it would be to construct an index which would show that the waters were perfectly calm.

All around us is discussion about basing a commodity dollar upon a price index, and all around us are commodity indexes, the fathers of which would each be willing to have the child of their brain selected as the basis for whatever of fluctuation in the form of currency the Government may be able to effect.

I am glad to say that in the last few weeks the argument in favor of bringing in various other indexes has very much subsided. The general opinion now seems to be, and Prof. Irving Fisher has definitely said that the best index is that of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. If we are to try a financial experiment as hazardous as this one will be at best, certainly we should at least attach it to an index compiled with consummate honesty and sincerity, compiled without bias, and with as great a degree of sincere, intelligent application and efficiency as it is possible under present conditions to secure.

I have conferred with Prof. Irving Fisher and other exponents of the commodity dollar, but as yet have not been able to bring myself to accept this position. However, even though I do not advocate the commodity dollar, if we are to attach our monetary system to a commodity index, I wish to say emphatically that the one which has been developed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics should be definitely and specifically named in the law; and the finances of that Bureau should be definitely and permanently strengthened to enable it to keep this index up to its present degree of excellence. While most of the men with whom I was closely associated in that Bureau are no longer there, my interest in the work which they started will continue. I know the work the Bureau has done; and the record of nearly half a century of absolute squareness and fair dealing should be kept in mind.

I have today talked only of the wholesale price index. Later I want to take a few minutes on retail price and the cost-of-living indexes.

GOLD VALUATION OF THE DOLLAR

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I had intended to address the Senate this afternoon, but I find I shall not have an opportunity to do so. I desire to announce that I shall address the Senate tomorrow as soon as I can get the floor.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING in the chair), as in executive session, laid before the Senate several messages from the President of the United States submitting nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arkansas.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 23, 1934, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 22 (legislative day of Jan. 11), 1934

SUPERINTENDENT OF THE MINT

A. Raymond Raff, of Philadelphia, Pa., to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa., in place of Freas Styer.

MEMBER OF THE CALIFORNIA DÉBRIS COMMISSION

Maj. Elroy S. J. Irvine, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as a member of the California Débris Commission, vice Lieut. Col. Henry A. Finch, Corps of Engineers, relieved.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

DENTAL CORPS

To be first lieutenant with rank from January 1, 1934

First Lt. H. Beecher Dierdorff, Dental Corps Reserve.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO AIR CORPS

First Lt. James Frederick Phillips, Corps of Engineers, with rank from September 28, 1927.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 22, 1934

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Dr. Raphael H. Miller, pastor of the National City Christian Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, in whose hand our breath is and whose are all our ways, we approach the duties of each adventurous day in the recognition of our humble dependence upon Thee. We thank Thee for the exacting tasks and perilous choices that make us men and pray that Thou wilt heighten and inform our human faculties with the divine spirit of understanding and of power. Help us this day to find temporal meanings in Thy everlasting word, save us from cynicism and despair in the presence of tasks that are too great for us, and lift up our eyes to see the eternal background against which all our acts find worthy and enduring meaning. Rekindle upon the vacant altars of our hearts the fires of moral passion and spiritual hope that our spirits may not falter before Thy divine requirements nor our vision contract before the urgent needs of men. Renew within us this day, O God, the sense of a reality of Thyself and sustain us from the unfading resources of Thy love and care. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 20, 1934, was read and approved.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL—FISCAL YEAR 1935

Mr. AYRES of Kansas, from the Committee on Appropriations, presented a privileged report from that committee on the bill (H.R. 7199) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for other purposes, which was read the first and second time and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. SWICK reserved all points of order on the bill.

THE DEVALUATION OF THE GOLD DOLLAR AND THE RESTORATION OF NORMAL PRICE LEVELS

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by including therein a speech which I delivered on yesterday over the radio on the gold bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ELLENBOGEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following radio address delivered by myself from station WJAS, Pittsburgh, January 21, 1934:

Last week was a momentous one for the Congress of the United States. Fundamental principles concerning the currency of the United States, the possession and ownership of all monetary gold in the United States, and the future of our trade, both foreign and domestic, were involved.

On Monday, January 15, shortly after the opening of Congress, a message arrived from the President of the United States, requesting legislation to improve the financial and monetary system of this country.

President Roosevelt and former Presidents of the United States have sent many messages to the Congress, but few have been as important and have dealt with such fundamentals as did this one.

In the message the President declared that "the issuance and control of the medium of exchange which we call money is a high prerogative of government." The President asked Congress to enact a law which will vest in the Government of the United States the title to and possession of all monetary gold within the United States, so that the gold could be used as a permanent and fixed metallic reserve.

The Constitution provides in article I, section 8, that "the Congress shall have power to coin money and regulate the value thereof." The power of Congress to pass this legislation is therefore clear.

THE PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

Let me explain to you the most important features of the bill. They are as follows:

Under our present law there are 25.8 grains of gold in each gold dollar, or, to put it in a different way—an ounce of monetary gold has a definite value, fixed by a previous act of Congress, of \$20.67. Under this bill the President is authorized to change the content of gold in a gold dollar, and is directed to reduce that content by not less than 40 percent, and by not more than 50 percent. That is, the President is given the power to give a new value to the dollar by reducing its content of gold 40 to 50 percent. If the reduction is 50 percent, then monetary gold will have a value of double the present amount; that is, it will be worth \$41.34. As a result the dollar will be depreciated in terms of gold, or gold will be appreciated in terms of the dollar.

Of course, that does not mean that the unit of the dollar, as such, will be changed. A dollar will still be a dollar and still have 100 cents. Let me repeat, the gold content of the dollar will be changed, thus bringing about a substantial change in prices, in wages, and in salaries, but the dollar as a unit will, of course, be the same.

PRESENT ABNORMAL VALUE OF THE DOLLAR

The purpose of these provisions is to restore the dollar to a normal purchasing power. In the last few years the purchasing power of the dollar has increased enormously. In 1933, for instance, a dollar would purchase much more goods than it did in 1929. Another way to express the same thing is by saying that the price of commodities or goods has been greatly reduced. If you consider 1926 as a normal year and compare it with 1933, you will find that the commodity price index, which was 100 in 1926, was only 60 in March 1933. That means that something which sold for an average of \$1 in 1926 only brought 60 cents in March 1933.

You might think at first glance that cheaper prices for the goods which you buy are desirable. That is not so when there is a general fall in prices, because the tremendous fall in the prices of all goods and commodities was responsible for throwing millions and millions of our people out of employment and for bringing about a tremendous reduction in the salaries and wages of those who were still employed. The restoration of normal prices will go a long way towards creating jobs for those who are now unemployed and for increasing the wages and income of everyone.

THE BURDEN IMPOSED BY THE ABNORMAL PURCHASING POWER OF THE DOLLAR

The swollen purchasing power of the dollar, as it exists today, has made the burden of debt upon the home owners, the farmers, and the middle class wellnigh unbearable.

Here is what it does:

The dollar of today as compared with the dollar of 1926 has a purchasing power of \$1.43. So that, if in 1926 you incurred a mortgage debt on your home of \$5,000 and must repay that mortgage today, you are not repaying \$5,000 but \$7,150 in terms of real purchasing power. Father Coughlin is entirely justified when he says that such a dollar is not a sound dollar nor an honest dollar. It is a dishonest, a cheating dollar.

The present dollar cheats every person who owes money. It cheats the wage earner and the salaried employee, because the low prices of goods and commodities have forced down wages and salaries.

At this moment I might say that every precaution should and, I trust, will be taken so that prices of goods will not rise quicker than the earnings of the wage and salaried men and so that consumers will be protected.

A \$2,000,000,000 STABILIZATION FUND

The bill before Congress also creates a \$2,000,000,000 stabilization fund, a fund which the American Government will use to defend us against depreciated currencies of foreign nations. Many foreign countries have depreciated their own currencies in order to receive a part of the foreign trade which we have heretofore enjoyed. This must be prevented in the future. The stabilization fund will be used to protect our foreign trade and to preserve our currency at a level which will serve the best interests of the United States and of our people. This fund will be useful in attack as well as in defense.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WILL ACQUIRE TITLE TO ALL THE GOLD

Another section of the bill takes all the gold now owned by Federal Reserve banks, amounting to 3½ billion dollars, and vests the title and ownership of such gold in the Government of the United States. You will remember that several months ago private persons who owned gold coins were required to deposit their gold

holdings in Federal Reserve banks and received in exchange for their gold coins circulating bank notes.

At that time it seemed a grave injustice that gold should be taken from individuals and should be given to the Federal Reserve banks, which are owned by the banking interests of the United States. That injustice has now been remedied. With the passage of this bill—and the bill was passed by the House of Representatives yesterday—the gold will be taken from the Federal Reserve banks and will hereafter belong to the United States as a whole. At last all the monetary gold in the United States—the gold that is necessary for a permanent and fixed metallic currency reserve—has been taken from the hands of the bankers and has been placed into the ownership of the Nation as a whole—something which should have been done a hundred years ago.

LIBERATION FROM THE DOMINATION OF WALL STREET BANKERS

Through this ownership of gold Wall Street bankers have dominated the financial, the business, and the industrial life of the country.

At last the step has been taken—fundamental and far-reaching—a step that will remove the iron grip of financial giants from the throats of our people; a step that will bring a more stable dollar, a sound dollar, a dollar that will not be too high and unfair to the debtor, nor too low and unfair to the creditor.

A step has been taken to lessen the burden of debt, a debt which has become unbearable for the home owner, for the farmer, and for the middle class. The basis has been laid to bring about, to restore, the normal value of the dollar, to stimulate our trade—both foreign and domestic—and to bring better times.

And on the pages of history will be written in indelible letters the name of Franklin D. Roosevelt, for if he accomplish nothing else, America will never forget that it was he who freed the American people from the domination of greedy and selfish bankers. It will never forget that Franklin D. Roosevelt returned to the people the essence of government, and that which has always been rightfully theirs.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall ask unanimous consent on January 29, the anniversary of the admission of the State of Kansas into the Union, to speak for 20 minutes upon the career of John James Ingalls, the one hundredth anniversary of whose birth occurred on December 29.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that at the proper time I shall make unanimous-consent request that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] address the House on Lincoln's Birthday on the life and character of Abraham Lincoln.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL—FISCAL YEAR 1935

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7199, making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for other purposes; and pending that motion I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SWICK] what requests he has for time under general debate?

Mr. SWICK. I have requests for about 3 hours.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. I think there are requests for about 3 hours' time on this side. Suppose we just carry on general debate this afternoon?

Mr. SWICK. That will be entirely satisfactory.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, pending the motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue this afternoon, the time for general debate to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SWICK] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 7199, the Navy Department appropriation bill, with Mr. LANHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. May I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SWICK] if he desires to yield some time at this time?

Mr. SWICK. I will yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have taken some time at this point for the purpose of calling the attention of the House and the country to certain facts that I believe are of the utmost importance.

In the first place, I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that under the Constitution the Congress is delegated the authority to appropriate money. Through the entire history of the country we have very assiduously guarded our rights under that authority. For the purpose of showing to the House and to the country how necessary it is that we maintain that right and that authority I want to recite to you a little of the history of the last 8 months. I want to recite to you some of the things that have been done in the name of emergency and in the name of relief. I want to show to the House and to the country how necessary it is, if we are to preserve an ordered Budget in this country and proper appropriations, that the House of Representatives continue to lay out these appropriations and to originate them. What an impossible situation we get into when we turn that authority over to the bureaucrats.

You will all remember that last June we were called upon to appropriate \$3,300,000,000 to the Executive, to do with just as he pleased, practically—that is the way it was laid out—to allot and to appropriate, and regardless of whether or not those items were for things that the Congress itself would authorize and appropriate for if it were brought up square-toed before the Congress. That appropriation was supposed to take care of relief. Just by way of prefacing, let me say to you in a general way that \$1,500,000,000 of that \$3,300,000,000 was allocated by the bureaucrats to be used at a time subsequent to the 1st of July 1934, and of that \$1,500,000,000, \$300,000,000 was allocated to be used subsequent to the 1st of July 1935, one year and a half from now; and very substantial proportions of that \$300,000,000 were allocated to be used after the 1st of July 1936, at a time when those in authority now tell us the depression would long since have been over, and in face of that allotment of one and one half billion dollars to be used after the 1st of July we are now being flooded with propaganda to appropriate more money for relief, when there is a billion and a half allotted by the bureaucrats to periods beyond the time when they tell us it is not going to be necessary.

Mr. KVALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KVALE. It occurs to me that perhaps a large share of that \$300,000,000 authorized to be spent subsequent to July 1, 1935, is for the completion of projects which are now being begun and which cannot be completed in 1 year's time, such as the upper Mississippi waterway development. Would that be true?

Mr. TABER. Well, now, it is true that those projects cannot be completed within that time, but they were not relief projects. They were propaganda projects, and the bureaucrats were catering to the propagandists.

There possibly is not anything that could better demonstrate to this House the absolute necessity of allocating all the funds that we appropriate.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BYRNS. The gentleman, as I understand, takes the position that Congress should have allocated the entire sum of \$3,300,000,000.

Mr. TABER. If it was necessary to appropriate it at that time.

Mr. BYRNS. Yes; I so understood the gentleman. Now, of course, the gentleman knows that Congress has been working under unusual conditions and circumstances. This money was appropriated primarily for the relief of the unemployed with the idea that when expended it should be expended in some constructive way so that those receiving

relief would be rendering some service to the Government rather than be given doles.

Now, I ask the gentleman, would it not have been absolutely impossible for Congress to have allocated the \$3,300,000,000 to the various projects covering construction of small and large projects as the gentleman indicates should have been done? The gentleman knows if that had been proposed his committee would necessarily have had to consume not weeks but months in undertaking to say whether or not those particular allocations were proper. The delay would have defeated the whole purpose of the appropriation.

In the very nature of things, I may say to the gentleman from New York, it was necessary to intrust the expenditures of these funds to some officers of this Government in whom the people had placed their confidence.

Mr. TABER. I may say to the gentleman from Tennessee that it would not have been impossible for Congress to have done that. It would not have been impossible for the Congress in the space of 2 weeks to have covered this picture.

Now, I shall go through the list; and when I get through, I shall be glad to have the gentleman point out to me those projects that Congress at that time was not competent to pass upon.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman permit me to make this one other observation, because I do not want to interrupt his remarks. The gentleman recalls, of course, what was called the "Garner bill", introduced at the last session of the Seventy-second Congress.

Mr. TABER. I do.

Mr. BYRNS. If I recall correctly, I think the gentleman himself was one of the most severe critics of the proposal for the construction of certain buildings.

Mr. TABER. It was a "pork barrel" bill.

Mr. BYRNS. And I assume that if the allocations had been made as the gentleman says now should have been made with reference to this fund, it would have had, perhaps from the gentleman himself and from other Members of the House, considerable criticism as to the manner in which it was to be expended.

Mr. TABER. I may say to the gentleman from Tennessee that I believe now, and believed at the time the Garner bill was introduced, that it was a "pork barrel" bill. It transcended almost anything we had dreamed of up to that time; but the pork-barreling of the bureaucrats is so far beyond it that there is no comparison. The bureaucrats can go so far beyond Congress in pork-barreling money that there is absolutely no argument on the subject.

Mr. BYRNS. I understand the gentleman does not complain of the amount which was appropriated, but that his complaint is directed solely to the way in which it was done.

Mr. TABER. I do complain of the amount which was appropriated, because I do not believe that a lot of these projects which were in contemplation provided substantial employment to justify them or that the projects justified themselves; and I do not believe that anywhere near so much money was necessary to provide the actual relief that was necessary. That is my position.

Mr. BYRNS. That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. TABER. That, of course, is a matter the gentleman can discuss and about which he can hold his own opinion; but I am stating what I believe. I am making the same statements today that I made here the 10th of June.

Now, I shall say one or two words by way of preface before I run through the list. It has always been customary for the Congress in making appropriations to provide in the current fiscal year funds to be used in the succeeding fiscal year.

For instance, it provided sometime in 1933 the funds to be used in the fiscal year 1934, except for minor deficiency items. Following the usual custom, we at this session should provide funds to be used for the fiscal year 1935; and the funds which are to be used in the fiscal year 1936 would be provided in the next session of Congress. However, instead of waiting for the legislative appropriation bill of this

year—and I direct attention to pages 80-A and 81-A of the Budget message—there was allocated for the completion of the Library of Congress Annex, \$2,300,000. This could just as well have waited and been carried in the legislative appropriation bill this year. There was no excuse for putting it in an allotment of this fund which was to provide relief.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Had Congress already authorized the construction of the annex to the Library of Congress?

Mr. TABER. Yes; my understanding is that it had.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. That being the case, why should they not allocate money to go forward with that work, thus providing employment, instead of waiting until next year?

Mr. TABER. They did not provide for work, because the work is not going to come until after the 1st of July next.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. They have cleared the site. Somebody had to work to clear the site.

Mr. TABER. That was a small item. Little less than \$500,000 was spent.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. But it helped the unemployed. They are probably working on plans, and this gives employment to draftsmen and architects. The purpose in allocating the money was to give people work now, not next year.

Mr. TABER. It should have been done in the proper manner. This money should have been allocated by Congress to the specific purpose.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. That is a poor excuse. Congress is responsible for the completion of this annex, for Congress authorized it. What difference did it make in what manner the money was secured? If men could be given work while Congress was not in session, I think we should commend those responsible rather than condemn them.

Mr. TABER. But Congress should not delegate authority for a bureaucrat to abuse.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I think the gentleman is about the most valuable man his side of the House has in Congress today. But I want to tell him that if he will go and look behind the present Library Building, he will find that all those old brick buildings covering that entire block have been razed to the ground, have been removed, and that the block of ground is clear now for the new building he is speaking of and about which he is arraigning Congress. Money had to be appropriated before the above could be accomplished.

Mr. TABER. I do not believe in segregating money to things that do not provide for relief out of so-called "relief appropriations" and then being out of money to take care of your relief obligations.

Then there are a great number of allotments for independent establishments. I shall not mention the real small ones, but I shall go down the line on the big ones.

There is an allotment of \$65,190,000 to the Civilian Conservation Corps to be used after July 1 next. There was absolutely no excuse for that, because it does not represent the continuance of a contract; it was an item that could well have been taken care of in the current appropriation bill.

There was an allotment to reserves of \$30,000,000.

There was an allotment of \$31,000,000 to the Tennessee Valley Authority. Unquestionably this could have been taken care of in the regular appropriation bills to come along in this session of Congress.

There was an allotment in the Department of Agriculture of \$6,000,000 for physical improvement, tree diseases, and so forth, that could well have been taken care of in our regular Agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I would rather wait until I finish this list, if the gentleman will permit. Then I shall be glad to yield.

There was an allotment of \$215,000,000 for Federal-aid highways. This has always been taken care of as the money was going to be used. This is not available for expenditure until after July 1.

There was an allotment for forest highways of \$7,500,000—and these are the ones available after July 1, 1934—an allotment for forest roads and trails of \$6,200,000.

There is an item for public-land roads of \$1,500,000, an allotment for animal-industry construction of \$490,700, for plant industry \$1,000,000, and miscellaneous items totaling for the Agricultural Department allotment beyond July 1, 1934, \$238,321,800.

For the Department of Commerce there was an allotment for the Coast and Geodetic Survey of \$6,000,000, which has been withdrawn. There was an item for construction and repair of lighthouses, vessels, and aids to navigation, of which \$2,153,000 was available in the fiscal year 1934, which we are now in, and \$2,925,000 will be available in the fiscal year 1935 after July 1 next, and will operate largely to reduce the regular appropriations for the year 1935 which we are making here and covering mostly items which have heretofore been taken care of in the regular annual appropriation bill. There was also available approximately \$300,000, which is not to be reached until after the 1st of July 1935.

In the Department of Interior there were allotments totaling \$197,500,000, of which \$58,400,000 were available in 1934, \$111,300,000 in 1935 after July 1, next, and \$27,500,000 not until after July 1, 1935.

When we have given contract authorization or otherwise, we have never appropriated money until it was to be spent. We have sometimes given contract authorizations, but we have not made the funds available.

I come now to the Labor Department, and find for immigration stations—mostly small items that can be built quickly; there was \$1,500,000 available in 1934, the current fiscal year, and practically \$400,000 available in 1935 after July 1, 1935.

We come to the Navy Department. The Navy Department report is probably right in front of the gentlemen. Please turn to page 4. You can see how that was allocated. There was \$53,000,000 out of \$274,000,000 allocated for the fiscal year 1934, which we are in now. There was \$146,000,000 allocated to be spent in the fiscal year 1935, \$69,000,000 allocated to be spent in the fiscal year 1936, and \$5,000,000 to be spent after the first of July 1936.

Mr. GOSS. Nineteen hundred and thirty-seven.

Mr. TABER. Nineteen hundred and thirty-six. That is the fiscal year 1937.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Not until I finish with all these bureaus.

In the State Department there was a total of practically \$2,000,000 allocated, of which \$1,200,000 was available currently, and \$750,000 available after July 1 next.

For the Treasury Department there was allocated to the Coast Guard \$24,800,000, of which \$13,693,000 was available in 1934 and \$11,000,000 was not available until after July 1 next. There was allocated to public buildings \$39,000,000, of which \$10,000,000 was immediately available, \$22,000,000 not available until after July 1 next, and \$7,000,000 not available until after July 1, 1935.

For the War Department there was \$7,500,000 allocated to airplanes, of which \$3,500,000 is available in this year and \$4,000,000 not until after July 1, 1934.

For construction of buildings there was allocated \$57,000,000, and that was largely for buildings which the Congress and the departments had been asked for previously. There was allocated \$35,000,000 for use immediately, \$19,750,000 for use after July 1, and approximately \$2,000,000 for use after July 1, 1935.

For seacoast defenses there was \$1,750,000 for use after July 1 next. For ammunition, \$5,500,000 currently and \$500,000 after July 1. For roads and drainage in Puerto Rico, \$950,000 for use currently and \$540,000 for use after July 1.

For flood control there was allocated \$37,000,000 for use currently and \$6,694,000 for use after July 1. For the Winooksi River Dam, \$360,000 for use currently and \$1,195,000 for use after July 1. For rivers and harbors there was allocated \$40,000,000 for use currently and \$27,000,000 for use after July 1 next and \$6,600,000 for use after July 1, 1935.

For the Missouri River the allotment was practically all for use currently. For the upper Mississippi River there was allocated \$16,000,000 for use currently and \$16,000,000 for use after July 1, 1935. For the Bonneville Dam in the Columbia River there was allocated \$10,000,000 for use currently and \$7,000,000 for use after July 1 next and \$3,000,000 for use after July 1, 1935.

For the Fort Peck Dam in Montana there was allocated \$8,000,000 for use currently, \$15,000,000 for use after July 1, and \$7,000,000 for use after July 1, 1935.

For projects for State and municipalities there was allocated \$203,000,000 for use currently and \$182,000,000 for use after July 1. For railroad projects there was allocated \$83,000,000 for use currently and \$93,000,000 for subsequent use.

Of the total altogether, including projects that had been allocated between current use and use subsequently, there was allocated for use currently \$1,836,000,000, leaving \$1,173,000,000 for use in the fiscal year 1935 and approximately \$300,000,000 for use after July 1, 1935.

In making those allocations, very largely items have been entered into which have been accustomed to appearing in the annual appropriation bills and which cut down the bills that we are now considering.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The gentleman is not finding fault with the amount appropriated for the different items but is finding fault with the method of appropriating, as I understand it.

Mr. TABER. I am finding fault both with the method and, in many cases, with the amount.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Which ones, for instance, does the gentleman find fault with?

Mr. TABER. Well, I would not allocate any \$70,000,000 for the irrigation project on the Columbia River.

I would not allocate at the present time, frankly, more than enough money to begin construction on one of the 6-inch-gun cruisers, because I believe—and I have always believed on the Appropriations Committee—we ought to build one and get it right before we go ahead. After we get it right, I would be in favor of going ahead just as fast as we can. I am afraid we will get into the same difficulty we did with the 8-inch-gun 10,000-ton cruisers, where in the first block they found so many defects in them that they have not yet been able to correct all of them.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The gentleman has read, probably, three or four dozen items, and out of that number the gentleman picks one or two that he criticizes.

Mr. TABER. Oh, I could pick hundreds of them. I would not go along with two thirds of them.

Mr. BLANCHARD and Mr. PIERCE rose.

Mr. TABER. I yield first to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I want to get some information, if I can, on the C.W.A. In all of these sums allocated for expenditure after 1934 and 1935, is there anything to prevent reallocation of some of these amounts for use in the extension of the C.W.A. activities?

Mr. TABER. I would not want to pass on the legality of that, but I will just call the gentleman's attention to the fact that an allotment of \$6,463,000 was made to the Coast and Geodetic Survey and was withdrawn. Therefore, I believe that portions of these allotments should be withdrawn, and if it were necessary to continue real relief work, that should be done.

Mr. ARNOLD. Will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARNOLD. The burden of the gentleman's argument is that these allocations out of the \$3,300,000,000 fund were made sooner than is necessary, and then the gentleman states, in reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK], that he would not approve two thirds of the projects. The gentleman, of course, is a very profound student and has made a careful study of this matter of unemployment relief. If we eliminated two thirds of the projects, which the gentleman has said should be done, how is he going to take care of the unemployment problem and the relief problem in this country, unless we resort to the dole system?

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will go into the question, he will find that until we started the C.W.A. proposition, except where that has made more difficult the problem of private employers who were trying to give employment, that has been a good thing.

Out of that \$3,300,000,000 only \$400,000,000, according to the information that is in the Budget, was allocated to the C.W.A. or to direct relief work which provided substantial employment. This means that, perhaps, one eighth of the total money that we threw into the pot last summer has been used for what we supposed it was going to be used—the purpose of relief—and most of the rest of it has been used for the promotion of pet projects.

Mr. ARNOLD. Does the gentleman mean to say that the building program, outside of the C.W.A. work, is not an employment program or a relief program?

Mr. TABER. I mean to say that very largely it is not providing sufficient employment from a relief standpoint to justify the amount that we are putting into it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SWICK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from New York 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ARNOLD. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ARNOLD. With the vast fund of knowledge at the gentleman's command, I think it would be very enlightening to the House and to the committee if he would outline to us just how he expects to handle this unemployment and relief program if he is not satisfied with the program that has been laid out under the \$3,300,000,000 appropriation. I think constructive criticism from the gentleman would be helpful.

Mr. TABER. I may say to the gentleman that as a relief proposition most of these public buildings are not relief projects. They provide a very small amount of employment considering the amount of money they cost. I made an investigation with the information I could obtain from the Supervising Architect's Office 2 years ago, and I found it was costing \$5,400 to put one man to work for a year in that work, and the other problems were somewhat similar. River and harbor projects at that time were costing \$4,800 to put one man to work and public roads \$3,600. It is now a little less, but the amount is very substantial. These things do not result in putting people to work the way they should be if we are operating this as a relief proposition.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Can the gentleman tell us about how much money has been expended on irrigation and reclamation projects?

Mr. TABER. Yes; substantially. Does the gentleman mean the entire amount during the history of the work?

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. No; I mean during the last year.

Mr. TABER. In this operation?

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Yes.

Mr. TABER. There was \$51,000,000 allocated for immediate use in the 1934 operation, and that item includes, for the Bureau of Reclamation, \$15,000,000, and for a lot of other items that go along with it, probably \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000, that you would call irrigation. Then, for the next year, 1935, there is \$60,000,000, and for the following year \$22,550,000; that is, after July 1, 1935.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. What does the gentleman think of the policy of spending upward of \$100,000,000 or more for

reclamation and irrigation to bring more land into cultivation while we are spending several hundred million dollars to induce the farmers to withdraw lands from cultivation?

Mr. TABER. That is in line with the policy of the bureaucrats of pulling both ends against the middle until the middle gets "powerful" thin.

Mr. ARNOLD. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. ARNOLD. I regret the gentleman has not answered to my satisfaction the question I propounded a few moments ago, or I think to the satisfaction of the Members here. It is very essential we have constructive criticism and not destructive criticism of these matters.

Now, if the gentleman can give to this House and the country another plan for taking care of the unemployment situation, and relieve unemployment throughout the country, I think here and now is the time to do it.

Mr. TABER. I am sorry that the gentleman from Illinois has not been listening to what I have said. I am going to call the gentleman's attention again to what I have said, and say it over again. Out of the \$3,300,000,000 which has been made available, only \$400,000,000 has been allotted to provide some sort of relief among the people. These other problems of employment do not yield much employment for many. The employment in the C.W.A., if the schedule is kept down to what it has been revised, would probably provide some employment to take care of the worthy. The other things do not take care of the worthy, but by tremendous Government expenditures have prevented the resurrection and revival of private industry.

I hope the people will follow along some line which will stop this tremendous expenditure, far and away beyond the purpose for which it was supposed to be used.

Mr. ARNOLD. The gentleman objects to the allotment of \$400,000,000—

Mr. TABER. In proportion to the other allotments; yes.

Mr. ARNOLD. How much does the gentleman think should have been allotted?

Mr. TABER. I do not think two or three hundred million more would be excessive. This can be had by withdrawing allotments from unnecessary projects where the money is not to be spent before July 1, 1934.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman knows that in the 12 years of the Harding-Coolidge-Hoover regime hundreds of millions of dollars were expended for irrigation and reclamation. Why did not our friend from New York stop it?

Mr. TABER. We were stopping the expenditures for that purpose under Mr. Coolidge and Mr. Hoover.

Mr. PIERCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. PIERCE. The gentleman said that \$70,000,000 had been allotted for the Columbia River. I want to say that \$20,000,000 was allotted for navigation and power and ultimately there may be irrigation there.

Mr. TABER. The total cost of that Columbia River irrigation project is estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation to be \$115,000,000.

Mr. PIERCE. But not on the Columbia River.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I should like to preface what I have to say by acquainting any of you who may not know with the names of my new colleagues on the naval subcommittee. On the minority side, Dr. SWICK, of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BUCKBEE, of Illinois, have been my collaborators, while on my own side I have had the assistance of Mr. CARY, of Kentucky, and Mr. HART, of Michigan. I consider myself fortunate, indeed, to have had such able, industrious, and genial coworkers.

Sixteen years have passed since my party completely sponsored a naval appropriation measure. Much has transpired in that space of time touching the Naval Establishment.

It was my privilege, back in 1918, as a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, then led by that great naval

authority the late Lemuel P. Padgett, of Tennessee, to have had a part in shaping that last measure.

We were then at war. Two years previously we had authorized the largest naval-construction program ever projected by any power. That program was in course of construction, though progress on the larger units had lagged owing to the imperative need to build destroyers and submarine chasers for combating enemy submarines.

The consummation of that program, which would have entailed some further authorization to give a proper balance between the several combatant units, would have placed our country foremost in naval strength among the maritime powers of the world.

We were committed then to a navy second to none.

Our great war-time President, Woodrow Wilson, in the course of a speech at St. Louis, Mo., on February 3, 1916, was the first Chief Executive to give public utterance to that long-cherished aspiration of the Naval General Board in these words:

There is no other navy in the world that has to cover so great an area of defense as the American Navy, and it ought, in my judgment, to be incomparably the most adequate navy in the world.

I should like to appropriate them as an expression of my own views, then and now, and I should hope of all within the sound of my voice. Paraphrased, they find expression in the published United States naval policy in these words:

To create, maintain, and operate a navy second to none and in conformity with treaty provisions.

If we were headed for naval supremacy well beyond a decade ago, what has transpired in the interim to reduce us, not to an equable status with the foremost naval power today, Great Britain, but all things considered, to a questionable second position in the ratings of naval powers? Let us see.

In the first place, there was convened in Washington on November 11, 1921, a conference on the limitation of naval armament. Out of that conference came a treaty between the United States, the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan, halting the competitive construction of capital ships in the navies of such powers.

Times were hard then. Taxes were oppressive. The promise of lighter tax burdens dominated public sentiment and the treaty at the time may be said to have met with popular approval. I have never thought a clear understanding of its terms generally prevailed. It was widely believed at the time that the 5-5-3 ratio applied to all categories.

The treaty fixed our gross tonnage of capital ships, reducing us to parity with Great Britain and establishing a 5-3 ratio as to such units as between our own and the navy of Japan. It provided specifically for the replacement of allowed capital-ship tonnage. It also limited the unit and gross tonnage of aircraft carriers, establishing a 5-5-3 ratio as between the navies of Great Britain, the United States, and Japan, respectively. In lighter categories, while a maximum unit tonnage was established, the door was left wide open as to the number that might be built.

To adjust our capital-ship tonnage to the treaty-allowed strength, we were required to and did scrap vessels built and building roundly 840,000 tons.

That briefly explains the first phase of our relinquishment from the leadership that was within our grasp.

Now, the second phase: Following the Washington Conference, we immediately proceeded upon the theory of disarmament by example. That is to say, of not building to limits in restricted categories or keeping apace with the programs of cotreaty powers in categories unrestricted as to gross tonnage, in the hope that by such a course such powers would refrain from building, other than as they saw fit to replace over-age tonnage, and simply maintain proportionately the number of units within the several categories.

Mr. Chairman, disarmament by example has proved a dismal failure. Despite the proof thereof which we had abundantly prior to the second conference held in London, from which ensued the so-called "London Naval Treaty"

concluded in April 1930, we continued to mark time, or relatively so, right down to the summer days last past.

Despite the need for lighter tax burdens, a nation can ill afford to gamble with its national defense. It is not prudent economy. It is not good statesmanship to neglect the Navy even when the international horizon is clear, and certainly not when storm clouds are brewing.

However, Mr. Chairman, that is the course that has been steered, and it is because of it that we find ourselves today, nearly 4 years since the conclusion of the London Treaty and 12 years since the conclusion of the Washington Treaty, in an inferior position in the ratings of naval powers.

What do the figures show? As of December 5, 1932, as to combatant vessels: (1) Laid down and completed, (2) building, and (3) appropriated for but not building, since the Washington conference, the unit totals were 36 for the United States, 113 for Great Britain, and 128 for Japan.

As of about the same date we were short of treaty strength in under-age tonnage, roundly, 240,000 tons, as against 63,000 tons for Great Britain. Japan, I am advised, has perfected plans to be completely current with the treaty maxima in the several categories, all under age, upon the expiration of the treaty in December 1936. That is an indication of what limitation by example has done for us.

Mr. Chairman, I am a firm believer in limitation; but I believe that when we enter into such a compact we should do so with the firm intention of attaining and maintaining the exact ratios fixed in the agreement, either completely or in the same measure as other treaty powers.

I have heard and you have heard the Washington Treaty severely condemned. Possibly the best arrangement it was practicable to conclude emanated from that conference. I have felt that our representatives could have written that treaty in terms that absolutely would have preserved to us complete parity with our British friends across the sea.

However, despite the sacrifices that it entailed, it did have its compensations, and, in my judgment, very large and momentous ones. The principle of noncompetitive building was the creature of that conference, and, for the first time, the principle of limitation was given recognition. My quarrel is not so much with the scrapping that immediately ensued but with the policy of inaction that later ensued.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the action of governments do not consistently represent the popular will. The course that has been pursued under the leadership of our Republican brethren no doubt was in harmony with the popular will throughout the countries of the world, but the popular will, in my judgment, has not dominated the naval policies of the governments of our cotreaty powers.

Instead, those governments have harkened to the urge of selfish interests; to false propaganda thus inspired. Why, even to the well-known English naval writer, Bywater, has been attributed the statement that the sole effect of naval treaties to date has been to emasculate the British Navy and to rejuvenate other fleets. Bywater is too well informed to write that sort of stuff. I have shown you—I have given you the figures of what Britain and Japan have done while we have sat by and watched. How absurd they make Bywater's alleged statement. Fellow Members, it was nothing but the rawest kind of propaganda for home consumption; and, judging by what has been done, I have no doubt that it is owing to just that sort of buncombe that the sorely oppressed peoples of other lands have been milched to build navies larger than necessary to maintain reduced treaty ratios.

It is unfortunate, my friends, that we must thus be influenced to vote larger outlays upon our naval arm, but equality with the best we must have, and I am confident we will have under the leadership of that splendid man who now occupies the office of President of these United States.

I am not what is generally referred to as a big-navy man. I am for the smallest, best Navy we can possibly get along with, but my yardstick is the best Navy elsewhere maintained. I believe we can do much to control that mode of measurement. I believe that the peoples of the world over-

whelmingly are in favor of limitation. For economical reasons alone, when we meet in another naval conference in 1936, I do not believe that the spokesman of any nation will have the temerity sincerely to propose a return to the old order.

I sincerely hope and trust that out of that conference will come another treaty, equally as circumscribed as the London Treaty, but providing for decidedly less tonnage in the several categories, and if, perchance, capital ships as now defined are not to be completely eliminated, that such replacement units as may be agreed upon will be very materially reduced in tonnage and gun power.

Mr. Chairman, if the world knows that America is determined to live up to the letter and spirit of its own United States naval policy—to the letter and spirit of a Navy as envisioned by the immortal Wilson—these hopes, these aspirations, may not be in vain.

Under the leadership of President Roosevelt, we will sit at the next conference table with a full-treaty Navy, built and building. We may have some over-age tonnage in the destroyer category. We shall have replacement for much of it under way. In my judgment, in no other way may we look to continued limitation or to a reduction within the existing limitations.

Paradoxical as it may seem, although we are well on the road to a realization of treaty strength at this particular moment, the appropriation bill that I am presenting calls for a smaller appropriation than has been provided at any time since the Washington conference in 1922. Of course, the explanation is that in consequence of the authority contained in the National Industrial Recovery Act, the construction has been undertaken of 32 naval vessels under an allotment of \$238,000,000 of the appropriation authorized by that act.

These 32 vessels, plus the 22 vessels under way out of regular appropriations, will bring us current with treaty limitations in all combatant categories, completely ignoring tonnage that is classed as over-age, except one 8-inch gun cruiser, which may not be commenced under the terms of the London Treaty prior to January 1, 1935 (the middle of the next fiscal year), and three 6-inch gun cruisers of 10,000 tons each.

The Budget includes \$400,000 for commencing the last 8-inch gun cruiser. Our bill goes further and includes \$1,200,000 for commencing the three 6-inch gun cruisers, so that once more we find ourselves approaching a proper balance in the international naval scales.

Of course, practically every destroyer we have today, not building, technically is over-age, but I rather think provision soon will have been made for their replacement as well as other construction of a replacement character. We have 10 light cruisers approaching the age limit; and our submarines, in various tonnage increments, will be reaching the age limit commencing in the calendar year 1935. Over-age units of 3,000 tons or less may be laid down 2 years before such class of vessels actually become over-age.

Mr. Chairman, before turning to other phases of the pending measure, perhaps I should give a summation as regards the funds that the bill proposes shall be made available, contrasting them with the available funds the present year.

For the current fiscal year, including all appropriations, reappropriations, diverted funds, and unexpended balances, but excluding the so-called "permanent annual and indefinite appropriations", which occur automatically, the Department has available for obligation a total of \$347,431,837.

For next year, upon the basis of the bill we are presenting, it will have available for obligation approximately \$314,000,000.

Of the amount currently available, owing to impoundments in consequence of economy legislation, such as non-filling of vacancies, automatic increases in compensation, and the pay cut—in fact, the pay cut very largely—\$22,150,285 will not be expended, and owing to administratively imposed economies \$46,270,052 will not be expended.

Of the amount that will be available next year, it is not expected at this time that more than \$310,000,000 will be expended.

So, looking at the current and projected naval Budgets from the expenditure standpoint, the comparison is \$279,-011,500 for 1934 with \$310,000,000 roundly for 1935.

Our bill is \$1,585,148 less than the Budget total, so under our bill the 1935 cash expenditures will be a portion of that reduction under the Budget program of \$310,000,000.

The Bureau of the Budget has placed currently-available funds, and is expected to do likewise as to projected-available funds, upon a cash-withdrawal basis. That applies to the entire Federal service. Therefore, the appropriations we are called upon to make present the actual amount of cash that will be needed within the confines of the fiscal year 1935 to operate the several spending agencies of the Federal Government. I personally feel that the cash-withdrawal system is logical and sound and that under a well-organized Budget system is at all times quite necessary.

On page 3 of the report on the bill I have attempted to set out the principal factors contributing to the amount by which cash withdrawals during 1935, under the Budget, are expected to exceed the cash withdrawals during 1934. I shall not take the time to repeat them here.

Now, reverting to the bill, divorced from such things as carry-overs, indirect appropriations, and cash withdrawals; in other words, merely the direct appropriations which only enter into the total of a purely appropriational statement, our proposals call for a total of \$284,747,244 against the Budget total of \$286,332,392, or a reduction, and it is a net reduction, of \$1,585,148.

In the first place, let me say that only in a few isolated cases do the estimates as to individual appropriations exceed the current appropriations. Generally speaking, where that occurs, the increase is practically negligible.

The estimates, contrasted with the current appropriations as reduced by reason of legislative and administrative action, represent quite a substantial advance, which results from a general liberalization in the current year policy, by which practically all appropriations were in effect reduced by the imposition administratively of obligation limitations, and, among others, to the factors to which I have already referred on page 3 of the report.

Now, if you will turn to page 5 of the report you will find a complete exposition commencing thereon of our action upon the Budget estimates touching money phases.

I shall not attempt to discuss them all. Some of them need no further explanation. Some of them, however, I feel that I should enlarge upon.

In the list there are six items all related. They total \$376,697.

The Department closed the Great Lakes Training Station this year as a measure of economy. The San Diego station is now doing all of the recruit training. The Norfolk station is in a stand-by status, ready to resume on short notice. The Norport Training Station also has been closed.

The number of first enlistments are now exceeding last year's estimate, and the Department looks for a larger number next year. So much so that San Diego's capacity alone (2,100) will not be sufficient to accommodate them. Norfolk, with a capacity of 1,342, and San Diego, of course, could without any difficulty. However, we should not lose sight of some of the harmful consequences resulting from dispensing with the interior training station at Great Lakes.

This training station was established in 1904. Up to this fiscal year it has been continuously operated. It is the only Naval Establishment in the interior of the country. It affords the only naval contact for a very considerable portion of our citizenry far from either seaboard. Its discontinuance would not only interfere with the continuance of the long-established policy of endeavoring to maintain a nationally representative enlisted organization, but it would also upset the practice or create discrimination in the practice of permitting recruits to visit their homes, at their own expense, upon conclusion of their training and prior to being sent to sea. This practice has been responsible

for fewer desertions and, therefore, has saved an indeterminate amount of money and, obviously, has contributed to improved morale and greater efficiency.

The naval subcommittee considered the matter very carefully. We took up the question directly with the Secretary of the Navy. The Secretary's position is that the station should remain closed for reasons of economy. We do not propose to compel him to do something against his judgment, but we question the wisdom of keeping Great Lakes closed and we simply are making it possible for the Department to reopen it, if, upon further reflection, it should decide to pursue that course.

Aside from the considerations I have stated, we have an investment out there of roundly \$26,000,000. For the upkeep of this investment the Budget includes \$25,818. For less than 1½ percent of the investment the station may be reopened, appropriately maintained, and resume the training of recruits.

Then you will see an item showing an increase under the Naval Reserve of \$183,518.

The appropriation for this component for the current year is \$3,346,960. In consequence of legislation and administrative action but \$2,064,509 of this sum may be obligated. The reduction is being met by decreasing the number of officers and men on active duty, the number of pay drills from 48 to 24—none for the Marine Corps Reserve—by eliminating training for student aviation pilots and for aviation officers of the volunteer branch, and by reducing the number of flying hours from 45 to 30.

For 1935 the Budget includes \$2,561,991, which, while under the current appropriation, is roundly \$500,000 in excess of the amount which may be obligated the present fiscal year.

The estimate contemplates 36 pay drills for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, the same as for the National Guard, and some slight expansion in Reserve aviation expenditures, although holding to 30 hours' flying time for aviation officers.

There seems to be a unanimity of judgment among regular naval aviation officers, including the Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics, that 30 hours are entirely inadequate, and recommendation has been made by such official and other officers that provision be made for not less than 45 hours. The committee, concurring in that view, has made provision for 45 hours of flying time and for giving training to 280, instead of 250, Naval Reserve aviators; and 80, instead of 40, Marine Corps Reserve aviators, which has occasioned the addition of \$183,518 to the Naval Reserve appropriation and \$5,739 to the Marine Corps Reserve appropriation. The larger numbers are the numbers who will be eligible to receive aviation training. Providing for a lesser number would result in spreading the increase in the number of flying hours over all, and thereby defeat what is sought to be accomplished, namely, to give these men training adequate for the maintenance of their military flying efficiency. Otherwise the money would be wasted.

I might say, further, that there is considerable agitation, apparently fostered by the Naval Reserve Officers' Association, to increase the number of drills to 48. As I said before, the Budget is based upon 36 drills for all civil components, naval and military. We have held to 36, assuming that the House would be guided by the Budget recommendations.

Still referring to the table commencing on page 5 of the report, we approach a series of reductions.

The first grows out of the refusal of the committee and the House, in connection with the independent offices appropriation bill, to reinstate automatic promotions for the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

The Budget included \$2,673,327 for the Navy and \$299,130 for the Marine Corps, looking to the restoration of automatic promotions. As the independent offices bill passed the House it provided for no automatic promotions throughout the Federal service; but it did provide that officers of the commissioned services embraced by the joint pay act of 1922, upon advancement in rank, should receive the pay prescribed for such rank by such pay act, continuing the freeze, however, as to base pay within a rank and the tri-

ennial 5-percent automatic increases, commonly called "fogies."

The amendment occasioned an added expense of \$946,584 for the Navy and \$48,038 for the Marine Corps but permits a reduction for the phases denied of \$1,726,743 from the Navy estimates and \$251,092 from the Marine Corps estimates.

Next comes flying pay, which has been a bone of contention for a number of years.

Members will recall that section 10 of the independent offices appropriation act, fiscal year 1934, vested in the President authority to suspend the extra pay or reduce the rate of extra pay allowed to flying personnel while on flying duty, and to distinguish between degrees of hazard in various types of flying duty and make different rates of extra pay applicable thereto. Up to this time no change has been ordered by the Chief Executive in consequence of such authorization. The committee has concluded, therefore, to provide the funds to pay the number of recipients contemplated by the current appropriations, both for the Navy and Marine Corps—\$1,170,297 and \$141,306, respectively. Unless some adjustment downward is made by the President some of the personnel now drawing flying pay, listed on pages 252-255 of the hearings as to the Navy, will need to have their flying orders revoked in order that the limitations will be adequate to take care of the appropriate number of student aviators and new officer graduates of the flying school.

Flying pay for enlisted men is the next item and the reduction results from holding to the present year number—1,682. The Department wanted to raise the number to 1,746.

The next item, touching the pay of medical officers, I probably should enlarge upon.

When Veterans' Administration patients were evacuated from naval hospitals the Navy was left with considerable personnel that had been commissioned or enlisted solely because of the demands of such patients. This situation later became further aggravated by the contraction of certain naval activities. Then came the demand of the Civilian Conservation Corps for medical personnel, and surplus medical officers were assigned to that activity, which assumed the cost of their pay and allowances. On the 4th of January 1934, 200 naval medical officers were so employed. Other classes of medical personnel rendered surplus by the action with respect to veterans have been or will be eliminated either through resignation, retirement, expiration of enlistment, or transfer to other ratings. Of the 200 officers now on detail, the Navy has a present need for 57. If the Coast Guard should become a naval corps, it is estimated that 79 of the remaining 143 will be needed to care for Coast Guard personnel. That would leave a surplus of 64, and for this number the committee is providing furlough or one-half pay, permitting a reduction in the pay estimate of \$175,765. The Budget carries funds for the full pay and allowances of the entire number.

The reduction on account of clothing outfits is self-explanatory. The number of new recruits very largely is a guess. There were 7,061 in 1932 and 4,572 in 1933. It is true that the rate of reenlistments lately has begun to decline. Pay cuts, taking away reenlistment gratuities, and the suspension of automatic promotions very probably are reflected in the increase.

The pay of enlisted men also was cut 15 percent this year. Previously they had been exempted. Then, according to their rating, normally they receive a cash gratuity of either \$50 or \$25 for each year of their last expiring enlistment. That has been taken away. In addition, under the pay law they received an increase of 5 percent of their base pay for each 4 years, but not to exceed a total of 25 percent. That has been frozen as of June 30, 1932. I have never been in sympathy with economizing at the expense of the enlisted personnel; certainly not of those in the lower pay brackets. I think that course was and is a very great mistake.

Running down through the remaining items on page 6 of the report, I see no occasion to burden you at this time

with any further explanation. I have already spoken of the amount we have added for commencing three 6-inch-gun cruisers, and in speaking of new ship construction I referred to the large program now under way out of an allotment made to the Navy Department by the Public Works Administration.

The Department has received other allotments from that source, and I feel that I should not close without drawing them to your attention.

To date, according to my information, all such allotments total \$274,765,924. You will find a statement on page 4 of the report of the several allotments and the general purposes. Passing over the first item in that statement, to which I have already referred, the next five all relate to what we usually speak of as public-work projects. They total \$25,917,527, divided \$7,702,935 for reconditioning work and \$18,214,552 for new construction. Every item contributing to the total is listed in the hearings commencing on page 496.

The aviation allotment, the last in the table, will be used in this way:

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Navigational equipment..... | \$213,250 |
| Radio equipment..... | 457,759 |
| Maintenance, repair and operation, stations and aircraft..... | 714,600 |
| New aircraft completely equipped..... | 6,114,391 |

In view of the fact that something has been said here about the N.R.A. I shall refer to that matter at this time; and, in referring to the several allotments generally, it is questionable, in my judgment, if any better way existed for complying with the spirit of the National Industrial Recovery Act of getting money into the hands of wage earners in return for valuable and useful services rendered, both from the standpoints of promptness and ratio of labor to material and either by contract or navy yard or station labor. Approximately 85 percent of appropriations for the construction of ships, it has been calculated, goes to the payment of salaries and wages in producing and fabricating raw materials gathered practically in every State of the Union. Approximately 73 percent of the pending naval budget goes directly into salaries and wages. Considering the labor incident to the several stages of putting materials into the yards for fabrication, finishing, construction, or installation, it is easy to see how the 85-percent figure may be about the general average.

The committee has given consideration to the details of the several allotments embraced by the table on page 4 of the report. In no instance did it find a purpose that needed authorization, or further authorization, or a purpose for which an appropriation previously had been refused. Of course, all of the projected expenditures apply to objects, the Budget approving, for which the Congress sooner or later would have been called upon to appropriate. Whether or not it would make the appropriations or in as great or lesser measure would be mere conjecture. Suffice to say, it would seem that the Navy was ready to go forward with projects in conformity with the spirit of the National Industrial Recovery Act and in directions that will materially promote its efficiency and effectiveness.

May I express the hope that those of you who were not present at the time will read the able speech delivered in the House on February 22, 1932, by the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the Honorable CARL VINSON. It leaves no doubts as to the efficacy of naval building for creating a maximum of employment reaching into every corner of the country.

Before concluding, Mr. Chairman, there is one other matter I wish to dwell upon for a moment.

We are rapidly approaching full treaty strength. I think unquestionably we will reach that status as rapidly as the President may be able to accomplish it consistent generally with the public interest. With that in mind, I call your attention to my observation expressed to the Secretary of the Navy, commencing on page 651 of the hearings, with respect to the cost of maintaining a treaty navy. We must not lose sight of that factor. There is no use building ships if we are not going decently to maintain them and ade-

quately man them. The total annual maintenance cost we can do much to control. We must resist adding expenses not of an essential character, however, or by whomsoever urged, and we must search out and eliminate existing expenses that may be dispensed with without detracting from the efficiency and effectiveness of the Naval Establishment.

My hope is that before we shall be called upon to provide for the maintenance of a full-treaty navy the nations of the world will have solemnly covenanted to continue complete limitation of naval armament, substantially reduced in all of the several categories.

The peace and happiness and prosperity of mankind depend very largely upon such a course.

I thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. SWICK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SHOEMAKER].

Mr. SHOEMAKER. Mr. Chairman, I come before you this morning to call attention once more to a usurpation of power at the hands of a Federal judge. It so happens that in the State of Minnesota our banking situation is tied up with the same nefarious group, namely, the Chase National Bank of New York, the Wiggins gang, and for the past several years they have been organizing chain banks throughout the State of Minnesota. They had quite an organization orgy there in which they mulcted the people out of hundreds of millions of dollars. Their stocks were selling for several hundred dollars a share and those stocks have now come down to five or six dollars a share. Widows and orphans were asked to take the money they had on deposit by the presidents of these banks, especially by E. W. Decker. I put heat enough under him in the last 2 months so that he resigned as president of this bank. He is the man who secretly connived with Mr. Wiggins, of New York, of the Chase National, to defraud the people of the State of Minnesota out of thousands and millions of dollars. The State of Minnesota, through an executive order of the Governor, demanded an investigation of their method of selling stock. Their stock is worth from six to seven dollars a share on the market at the present time. The State Commerce Commission of the State of Minnesota was authorized to proceed with this investigation, which they started. The money was appropriated under the blue-sky laws of the State of Minnesota to make the investigation, and this last week, this group of highbinders and racketeers, international and local crooks, headed by E. W. Decker, the Northwest Bank Corporation, and the First National Corporation of St. Paul, went to a Federal judge, Judge Molyneaux, and got out a restraining order, restraining the State of Minnesota from proceeding in any manner against these organizations, either criminally or civilly, making it a sweeping mandate of hands off. In other words, this Federal judge has stepped in and assumed the position of dictator and is denying the right to the State of Minnesota to bring to the bar of justice these criminals for their criminal acts in the State of Minnesota.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHOEMAKER. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUFF. What has the State of Minnesota done in view of the action of this Federal judge?

Mr. SHOEMAKER. I am coming right now to that, because of requests from the State of Minnesota, if you please. There is only one thing which the State of Minnesota can do, and that is to appeal to Congress to take the power away from some of these judicial despots who have been wrecking our Government and absolutely reducing the opinion of our American court system to zero, and the only voice that the State of Minnesota has here is the voice of its Representatives in Congress. The only solution to this proposition is in the House of Representatives, if you please.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I am very glad that the gentleman is giving the House the facts that he is today. May I call his attention to one thing that occurred in the State of Michigan: When the Federal Radio Commission denied the right of that great State to install a radio system for the use of the police of the State, do you know what Governor Green,

of the State of Michigan, did? He installed the radio system without regard to the law or wish of the Federal authorities; the larger cities in the State followed suit; other States did the same thing; until today practically every State is able, through its radio, to communicate with its law-enforcing agents almost instantly, wherever they may be. Criminals are apprehended, and punished, who, under conditions existing prior to the installation of the police radio, would go unpunished. The courageous action of that Michigan Governor was a very decided contribution to law enforcement in this country. Had Federal authority had its way, this contribution would not have been made. There are certain rights in this country that inherently belong to the State, and if this Federal judge is guilty of what you outline here, he has gone far beyond the right or power of any Federal judge; he has denied the right of a State to throw the mantle of protection around its citizens. The gentleman from Minnesota is to be congratulated upon presenting these facts to the House.

Mr. SHOEMAKER. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear that, and I am glad to hear that the Governor of the State of Michigan had the manhood to go ahead. The people of the State of Minnesota have a right to be protected, and the Constitution of the State of Minnesota provides that they shall be protected against criminals of whatever nature.

I think the time has come when we may as well do something here in Congress, and do something at once, to show these despots, these representatives of big business, and this judge particularly, who has been the tool and puppet of the Power Trust and the Railroad Trust and the milling interests and the big business organizations in Minnesota in general a number of years, that they have gone too far. We have two judges of that kind in Minnesota. The other is John H. Sanborn, and I shall take care of his case later.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is anything more that is necessary for me to state at this time in respect to this matter. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the insertion of some telegrams and letters between the attorney general of the State of Minnesota and others as well as myself and also of a resolution which I shall introduce today.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., January 18, 1934.

F. H. SHOEMAKER,

1005 House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Judge Molyneaux signed order today restraining Minnesota Commerce Commission from proceeding with investigation of Northwest Bancorporation. Commission also is restrained from starting any action, civil or criminal. Suggest you demand a Federal investigation Bancorporation affair and acts of Judge Molyneaux interfering with sovereign powers of Minnesota.

F. T. WOLF.

NOVEMBER 30, 1933.

Hon. H. H. PETERSON,

Attorney General Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn.:

Please wire immediately Senator FLETCHER, Chairman Subcommittee on Banking and Currency, demanding investigation of Northwest Bancorporation and First National Corporation. Your support in my efforts will be appreciated and a great help toward eliminating like conditions in the future throughout the Northwest.

F. H. SHOEMAKER,
Member of Congress.

THE STATE OF MINNESOTA,
OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL,
St. Paul, December 1, 1933.

Hon. F. H. SHOEMAKER,

Member of Congress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANCIS: In answer to your telegram of Saturday, I beg to advise you that today the Commerce Commission of the State of Minnesota started an investigation of the Northwest Bancorporation and the First National Corporation pursuant to instructions issued by the Governor a couple of weeks ago. I presume that you were aware of this fact.

I should like to know why you want me to make a request upon Senator FLETCHER, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Banking and Currency, demanding an investigation of the Northwest Bancorporation and the First National Corporation in view of the pending investigation before the Minnesota Commerce Commission.

If you will advise me as to the facts that make this desirable at this time I will be very glad to join in your request. I think

that I should be in possession of information that will enable me to back up the action which I take, because undoubtedly I will be asked to explain why I have joined in such a request.

With best wishes and sincere regards, I am,
Yours very truly,

HARRY H. PETERSON,
Attorney General.

DECEMBER 4, 1933.

HON. HARRY H. PETERSON,
Attorney General, St. Paul, Minn.

DEAR MR. PETERSON: Referring to your letter of December 4, addressed to Congressman SHOEMAKER in connection with the investigation of the Northwest Bancorporation and the First National Corporation.

Mr. SHOEMAKER is now in Panama and will not be back until the first of the year. Having discussed the subject with Mr. SHOEMAKER, I take the liberty of submitting what we consider not only substantial but vital reasons why an investigation of the Northwest Bancorporation and the First National Corporation should be by Federal rather than by Minnesota authority.

The Northwest Bancorporation is organized under the laws of Delaware. It has 139 affiliated institutions, serves 115 distinct communities, and operates in 8 different States; namely, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Montana, Nebraska, Washington, and Wisconsin. It has been shown by Federal investigations already made that there has been a close connection between Wiggins, deposed and discredited president of the Chase National Bank, and Mr. E. W. Decker, president of the Northwest Bancorporation, Northwestern National Bank, and Minnesota Loan & Trust Co. The tentacles of this huge corporation reach over such a vast territory that it is beyond the limited power of a single State to show the danger lurking in interlocking directorates. You, of course, realize that Minnesota has no power to subpoena a witness beyond its own territorial limits, and any attempts to develop real testimony from without the State can be easily evaded.

We are of the opinion, therefore, that a State investigation would be a mere gesture without power of enforcement and would prove little but the futility of the effort. Whereas a Federal investigation has full power behind it to cover all interstate matters. A trained set of investigators are now employed by the Senate committee which is now in action and stripped for battle. A Senate investigation would receive national publicity which the State investigation would not receive, and if the State investigation should fail by reason of lack of enforcement powers, it would do more harm than good.

There is a nigger in the woodpile, and we suggest that the effort should be made by those in authority in Minnesota to enlist the other seven States interested; to join in a demand on the Senate committee through its chairman, Senator FLETCHER, to hold a speedy senatorial inquest which will be thorough and help to loosen the choking grip the Northwest is struggling under.

Yours very truly,

F. H. SHOEMAKER,
By OWEN M. LAMB,
Secretary.

House Resolution 233

F. H. SHOEMAKER submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized and directed, as a whole or by subcommittee, to inquire into and investigate the official conduct of Joseph W. Molyneux, a district judge for the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota, to determine whether in the opinion of said committee he has been guilty of any high crime or misdemeanor which in the contemplation of the Constitution requires the interposition of the constitutional powers of the House. Said committee shall report its findings to the House, together with such resolutions of impeachment or other recommendation as it seems proper.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearing, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the House is exceedingly fortunate in having in charge of naval budget matters my distinguished colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM A. AYRES, of Kansas.

Like myself, he has consistently stood for a Navy in accordance with our United States naval policy, but ever watchful to see that the cost is confined to absolute essentials and held to the lowest figure consistent with economy and efficiency.

The bill that he has presented to the House today, like similar measures he has presented in former years, well demonstrates his sound judgment touching naval matters.

I have examined his bill and I have read rather thoroughly his hearings and report, and I propose to give my support to his bill in all its various phases.

It calls for a total of \$284,747,244 of direct appropriations, as against \$308,669,562 for the current fiscal year. However, at this time it is not my purpose to speak to you with reference to the various provisions of the naval appropriation bill but to call to your attention the general condition and needs of the Navy.

Mr. Chairman, the fundamental naval policy of the United States, which has been affirmed for many years is, "To maintain the Navy in sufficient strength to support the national policies and commerce and to guard the continental and overseas possessions of the United States." Please note clearly that the protection against invasion of our continental territory is only one of the obligations which has been placed on our first line of defense. It may well be that the protection of outlying possessions and the support of our policies and commerce will prove the more difficult parts of the task.

It is important to recognize that, for it will help to clear away the statement which is made so frequently that the United States needs a navy for defense only; that is, for the defense of the coasts. It is to be hoped that the United States will never engage in war except for the defense of her rights, her obligations, or her essential interests. In that sense, our policy is purely defensive but, since we have vast interests beyond the seas, it follows that the Navy cannot be limited to coast defense. And it must be added as a military axiom that war, however defensive in moral character, must be waged aggressively if we are to hope for success.

For national security, it is not sufficient to have the will to enforce a principle which is firmly held and avowed. There must be a clear expression of national purpose accompanied by evident and sufficient means to carry it into effect. Provided the policy is maintained with a courteous consideration of the rights and susceptibilities of other nations, this will afford the surest safeguard against war. On the other hand, no condition is more hazardous than the existence of the dormant popular feeling which may be fanned to fever heat by a moment of great passions but behind which lies no organized power for action.

At the end of the World War the United States was about to become the dominant naval power of the world. When the Washington Conference assembled in the fall of 1921, we possessed a naval force, built and building, which was stronger than that of any other power. This had been created in accordance with our announced policy to maintain a navy second to none, which policy came into being because of the fact that during the World War we were unable to maintain neutrality and did not have the power to compel it. We felt deeply that our interest demanded this protection and it was obvious that the wealth and industrial resources of the United States made it possible for us to provide it.

No doubt, every Member of this House remembers the result of that conference. As an altruistic contribution to world peace, we took the unprecedented course of surrendering voluntarily the naval supremacy which we then possessed. We agreed to scrap 11 of the most powerful battle-ships and battle cruisers which have ever been designed. They were then approaching completion and had cost \$94,757,000. When finished they would have aggregated 465,800 tons. In addition, we agreed to scrap 20 completed battle-ships. Further, we agreed not to increase the strength of our naval bases or fortifications in the Pacific, except on the coasts of the United States, Alaska, the Aleutian Islands, Hawaii, and the Canal Zone, and not to establish new bases or fortifications in insular possessions which we then held or might acquire. In doing all this, we had announced to the world, in the most unmistakable terms, that we were willing to forego supremacy and that we would be content with strength equal to that of Great Britain but measurably greater than that of any other power.

No other country made a contribution to the cause of disarmament which can even be mentioned in the same

breath. Not only did we give up much more at that time than did any of the others, but, in addition, in the following years we were very slow to build anything else, whereas each of the other great navies was built up very actively in the classes which had been left unlimited. Within the space of 10 years, Great Britain provided for 134 new combatant ships, Japan 130, France 166, and Italy 115. By contrast, the United States provided for but 34. This culminated in the 4 years of the Hoover administration during which not one new ship was authorized for the United States Navy.

At the Geneva Conference of 1927 and at the London Conference of 1930 we were not in a position to make a similar sacrifice again and none of the others was willing to do so. Geneva was a complete failure and London arranged for no scrapping except that the disposal of a small number of the older battleships, which had been agreed upon at Washington, was somewhat expedited. There was, however, an agreement to limit the strength in each category which previously had been unrestricted but the percentage allotted to Japan in the lighter vessels was appreciably higher than that granted to them in capital ships and aircraft carriers at Washington. Since then Japan has made it clear that she is dissatisfied with any limitation below the strength permitted the United States and Great Britain, and it seems likely that she will refuse to continue the present ratios after the end of 1936, when the current agreement expires.

At the time of the conference, the belief throughout our country was that the ratio of 5-5-3 having been fixed, we would continue to maintain our Navy substantially at the specified level. Without doing so, it would be impossible either to guard our interests or to discharge our responsibilities. Instead of maintaining parity with Great Britain and a superiority over each of the other powers, we have let our strength in the lighter categories, that is, in the light cruisers, destroyers, and submarines, slip to fifth place and a very poor fifth at that!

When President Roosevelt entered the White House our prospective shortage, on the date that the treaty is to expire, amounted to the staggering total of 135 ships. To attempt to make up this great deficiency in the short time of less than 4 years then remaining was beyond the realm of possibility. However, a start could be made. The National Industrial Recovery Act authorized the President to undertake the construction of naval vessels and aircraft required therefor within the terms and limits of the London Treaty. Six weeks after this act had been approved and in accordance with its provisions, contracts were awarded for the construction of 32 ships of 120,600 tons. Besides these, in accordance with previous authorization and appropriation acts, contracts were let for 5 ships aggregating 17,400 tons.

The 37 ships so contracted for are the following:

| | Tons |
|---|---------|
| 1 10,000-ton cruiser with 8-inch guns..... | 10,000 |
| 4 10,000-ton cruisers with 6-inch guns..... | 40,000 |
| 2 20,000-ton aircraft carriers..... | 40,000 |
| 8 1,850-ton destroyers..... | 14,800 |
| 16 1,500-ton destroyers..... | 24,000 |
| 4 1,300-ton submarines..... | 5,200 |
| 2 2,000-ton gunboats..... | 4,000 |
| 37 | 138,000 |

Every single one of these vessels is desperately needed by the Navy. However, to provide against the remote possibility that the United States might enter into an international agreement for the further limitation of armament, the President is authorized by the National Industrial Recovery Act to suspend, in whole or in part, any naval construction undertaken under the provision of this act. A conference to consider naval armaments is scheduled to meet in 1935, but it is a fact that the United States is so far short of the limits provided by the London Treaty that it is utterly inconceivable that the navies of the world will be reduced to a point which would make any part of our new construction unnecessary. The Geneva Conference of 1927 and the London Conference of 1930 made it perfectly clear that no other nation is willing to scrap ships as we did by the Washington

Treaty in order to reduce its strength to that of the United States.

The primary purpose in building warships is to provide means for protecting our interests and for supporting our policies. In addition to this, however, the effect of shipbuilding as a stimulus to industry cannot be overemphasized. In the first place, the recent contracts assured employment for many thousands of skilled artisans, whose special training and abilities are essential to our continuance as a seafaring nation. Until August 1933 it had seemed certain that they would be forced into the ranks of the unemployed. In the second place, the building of a ship is a truly national undertaking, to which every State of the Union contributes a share. Steel, lumber, paint, machinery, electrical equipment, metal fittings, furniture, and so forth, come from widely separated sources and in great quantities. The assembly and transportation of these materials provide occupation for additional thousands, with the accompanying circulation of wealth, which recently has been so badly out of adjustment.

Then, when she is completed, each ship will require great quantities of fuel, food, ammunition, and other supplies of many kinds. Almost all these come from domestic sources, even when the ship is cruising in foreign waters. As an example, when the fleet made a goodwill cruise to Australia and New Zealand in the summer of 1925, the entire force of 25,000 men was entirely subsisted, fueled, and supplied from home ports for a period of 5 months, an undertaking which many had previously considered entirely impracticable.

In view of our inability to make up our great deficiency in under-age tonnage prior to the end of the London Treaty, it becomes necessary to extend the life of our present ships by making such repairs and alterations as may be necessary to keep them in a satisfactory material condition. Of course, it must be recognized that no amount of modernization can make an old ship equal to a new one. The art of designing and building has advanced so rapidly that that is not possible. Furthermore, the cost is high for the results achieved. It can be justified only on the ground that it is the best way out of a bad situation. We are unable to replace all the over-age units now, partly because of the excessive drain on the Treasury in a short time and partly because of the lack of sufficient shipbuilding capacity and finally because it is very important to spread out the program so as to make it as nearly uniform as possible. A steady work load is essential to economical construction as well as to the best design.

It is a fact, too, that any appreciable variation in the rate of building is apt to bring accusations that we are starting an armaments race. Nothing is further from our minds and there is no justice in the charge. It is but necessary to point out how very short we are of treaty limits and how very slow we were to build cruisers and destroyers and submarines after the larger categories had been limited, whereas Great Britain, Japan, France, and Italy strained every nerve to increase their strength. In spite of these facts, however, the announcement of our intention to commence part of the long-deferred building brought many allegations both from foreign sources and from some misguided Americans that this would be an unfriendly act and that it would compel corresponding action abroad. Such statements are absurd and they collapse as soon as the facts are known, but you may expect similar propaganda whenever we attempt to correct weaknesses which have been allowed to develop in a period of laxity.

Approximately 3 years will be required to complete the vessels which are now building. As the time approaches for the launching of each, we must be ready to lay down another so that the objective of a steady continuous program can be attained. We must break away from the old hit-or-miss system with alternating periods of intense activity and complete idleness with which we have been plagued in the past. Feast is almost as undesirable as famine. By holding to a steady work load, our ships will be cheaper and vastly better. They will be better designed and better built. I urge that

the United States adopt now a fixed policy of building its Navy substantially to the limit in each category which has been or may be prescribed by international agreement. This objective could be attained, without any unusual effort by the year 1939. When that objective has been attained, steady replacement of over-age ships should be provided for so that at all times we will have a Navy which is equal to its responsibilities. In this way, the welfare and security of our country will depend upon ourselves and not upon the generosity of any foreign power.

Most of you realize probably that a fleet is a very complex organization. No one type of vessel or weapon, in whatever numbers or of whatever excellence, is able to assume the entire burden of guarding our interests in the event of hostilities. Each has its special function which no other can discharge so well. Each has certain limitations which might prove fatal unless that blind spot were protected by the appropriate means. Yet we have insistent propaganda by some enthusiasts that our entire reliance be placed on one type, to the exclusion of all others. At one time it was fire ships, at another frigates, later on torpedo boats, to be followed in turn by submarines, and finally by aircraft. Still another school of thought insists that we abandon all else and entrust our homes and our loved ones solely to the protection afforded by a sense of our own altruism and righteousness.

Not at all! I maintain that our sure shield is an active, well-trained, fully manned fleet; made up of all types in the proper proportion. It is unnecessary to provide any one kind of equipment to excess, but we are faced with grave danger when one or more are allowed to become deficient.

What the proper proportion is may vary from time to time and is determined by many technical considerations, including our geographical situation and the strength of possible opponents. We must, of course, and we have every intention to adhere strictly to the limitations which are set by treaty. However, we have learned to our sorrow that a high-minded, self-sacrificing contribution to disarmament cannot be expected to influence any other nation to take a similar course. Consequently, we are forced to bring our strength in the several categories substantially to the level which has been agreed upon. In doing this, we cannot be justly accused of participating in an armament race or of planning to attack a neighbor. We are a peaceful people and would much prefer never to be drawn into war. At the same time one cannot fail to take note of the tense situation that exists throughout the world, and it would be foolhardy in the extreme not to make reasonable preparations against possible eventualities. Never was the maxim—"Trust in God but keep your powder dry", more apt than at the present.

A navy, to be of any use in times of emergency, must be maintained throughout the intervening times of peace. However patriotic our citizens or whatever effort they may be prepared to make, their exertions will be largely ineffective if they are delayed until the last minute. Even with unlimited money, the building of a ship requires a long time and a very expert organization. Then, when she has been completed, another long period of intensive training of her crew is required before she can be considered ready to take her place in the battle line. During the World War the United States suspended all other building for the Navy in a superhuman effort to turn out destroyers with which to fight the U-boats. A hundred and seventy-one of this type were laid down, but only 38 of them were completed and only 27 reached the war zone prior to the armistice. And a destroyer is a small ship which can be built more quickly than any other type. In general, it may be accepted as true that a naval war must be fought with the vessels on hand at the outbreak of hostilities. Woe betide that nation which delays its preparation until the hour of need!

By the London Treaty the United States, Great Britain, and Japan agreed not to lay down any replacement battleships until after 1936. In 8-inch-gun cruisers, we are allowed 18, of which the seventeenth will be commenced in 1934 and the eighteenth can be started in 1935. In the

6-inch-gun cruiser category, however, we will be 33,000 tons short of our allowance, even after the four 10,000-ton units recently contracted for have been built. This shortage is important and must not be forgotten.

In the air our Navy has been a pioneer. Perhaps we have gone farther in that field than any other power. Certainly there is throughout the Navy a very thorough realization of the importance of fleet aviation. All concerned are determined to maintain and to develop this arm. Until now the great need has been for additional aircraft carriers. Under the Washington Treaty we are allowed 135,000 tons of carriers. We have completed 2 of 33,000 tons each and 1 experimental carrier of 11,500 tons, which may be replaced at any time, and we are building 3 which will aggregate 53,800 tons. The first of these, the *Ranger*, which will be commissioned next spring, is the first carrier which we have designed originally for that purpose. The *Lexington* and *Saratoga* were converted from battle cruisers, and the *Langley* originally was a collier. Since carriers are such a new type, it would seem wise to delay using up our remaining tonnage in this category until the *Ranger* has been in commission for a time. It is important to test her thoroughly so as to be sure that we know just what features should be incorporated in future designs.

In destroyers our situation is vastly different. Indeed the United States is shockingly and dangerously deficient in this category. By treaty we are allowed 150,000 tons of them. A casual examination of the Navy list might lead one to think that our situation is satisfactory, for it now shows a total of 251 destroyers of 267,470 tons. The "nigger in the woodpile" is that every last one of them will have become over-age within the next few months, and their military usefulness is about at an end.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF. As a matter of fact, have not a large majority of these destroyers been tied up at the docks for a number of years, out of commission?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Is it not a fact that a ship out of commission deteriorates much more rapidly than one in commission?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is entirely correct about that.

Mr. WOODRUFF. And it is for that outstanding reason that it is important to replace these destroyers at the earliest possible date?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I wonder if the gentleman or his committee has given any thought to the dieselization of some of these ships? With all other nations dieselizing their merchant marine and navies, the United States seems, for some reason or other, to eliminate the diesel engine entirely, especially from use on battleships. There is no sound reason for this.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I may state to my colleague that is a technical engineering matter that is better passed on by the technical experts than by us laymen on the committee; but we all recognize in a general way the great usefulness and advantage of the diesel engine over some other types of engine, and it is to be hoped that the Navy will use that type of engine if they find it satisfactory.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I am very glad to hear the gentleman say that, but I wish to say to the gentleman that the trouble with the technical men in the Navy is that they are afraid to recommend dieselization of the battleships, because they say it is experimenting. It is not experimenting, because other nations of the world have done it with success. All other nations cannot be wrong and the United States right. The diesel engine should be installed in some of these ships.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I do not agree with the gentleman that the technical experts in the Navy Department are

afraid to blaze out on new untired pathways or trails; but it is purely a technical matter as to the character and type of machinery used on the various types of ships and it must be handled by technical experts. Now, let me call attention again to the situation of the destroyers.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I do hope the Naval Affairs Committee will give this matter some thought. The diesel engine industry is needed in time of war. Every other large Government is helping the industry, but the United States at this time does nothing. It is essential that something be done. Let them put diesel engines in tankers, airplane carriers, mine layers, and so forth, if they do not want to place them in battleships. If this were done, the Navy would learn how valuable these engines are.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. They were built as a part of our effort in the World War, and the last of them were completed in 1922. From that year until 1932 we laid down not a single unit of this type, whereas in the same period Great Britain laid down 36, Japan 43, France 55, and Italy 39. Even if our war-time destroyers were as well designed as those recently built by foreign powers, which they most certainly are not, their very age would place them at a most serious disadvantage in action. One might as well expect a model T Ford which has been on the road for 10 years to give the same service as the latest V-8. A start has been made, under the leadership of President Roosevelt, toward remedying this bad situation. We now have under construction 32 destroyers which will aggregate 50,800 tons. However, this program must be recognized as a start only, and it is imperative that we continue uniformly.

In submarines our position is somewhat better, though far from satisfactory. The United States, Great Britain, and Japan are allowed to have 52,700 tons each in this category. At the end of the London Treaty the under-age tonnage remaining to each from those now in commission will be:

| Country | Subma- rines | Tons |
|--------------------|-----------------|--------|
| United States..... | 18 | 24,810 |
| Great Britain..... | 30 | 38,400 |
| Japan..... | 38 | 52,272 |

In addition to the above, we have under construction 6 submarines of 7,460 tons, Great Britain 7 of 7,805 tons, and Japan has 6 of 8,200 tons. Besides these, Japan has appropriated for 9 more of 11,000 tons. Provided all of the above are completed, it is easy to see that our total of under-age tonnage at the expiration of the treaty will be 20,430 tons less than permitted, whereas Japan will have an excess of 18,772 tons. This excess is allowable under the provision of the treaty which authorizes the laying down of replacements 3 years in advance of the year in which the unit to be replaced becomes over-age. It emphasizes, however, the Japanese determination to keep right up to the treaty limits in contrast with our complete failure to do so. Also it should be remembered that the signatories are not required to reduce to the limits set until December 31, 1936. Until that date any excess tonnage which happens to exist may be retained.

There is a grave misunderstanding in our country as to what a Navy must be in order to exert its full influence for peace. Almost invariably, naval strength is spoken of in terms of the numbers of ships built and building, without consideration as to whether they are manned or whether it is possible to obtain trained crews for them. Some people seem to think that a ship is always ready whether she is manned or not.

At the time of our entrance into the World War, the United States possessed a highly trained battleship force, but little else. It became necessary immediately to expand the Navy very greatly, to provide armed guards for merchant ships, to train crews for the troop transports, without which our armies could not reach the scene of action; to man destroyers and submarine chasers and mine layers and con-

verted yachts. But, to do these things trained men must be provided in great numbers, and there was no reservoir from which they could be drawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. We were fortunate indeed that the battleships were not required to engage in battle at once. By turning them into training schools and by placing each trained man where he would be most useful, it was possible to instill in many thousands of new men the rudiments of their naval duties. The task was accomplished and brilliantly, but please do not forget that it completely destroyed for the time being the readiness for action of a force which a few months before had been prepared for any emergency.

Mr. GOSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. GOSS. Is the gentleman planning to offer an amendment to the pending bill which will increase the building program?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Of course it would not be in order. I will say that the Naval Affairs Committee is holding hearings today, and I hope during the week to report out a bill authorizing Congress to bring the Navy up to treaty strength.

Mr. GOSS. It is too bad the gentleman cannot give us that authorization while the bill is pending.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The bill will probably be pending, because we hope to get it out of committee this week.

Mr. HEALEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. HEALEY. I observe that the item for pay, subsistence, and transportation is less in this bill than it was in the 1934 estimate. Does that mean it is contemplated to operate the naval vessels with a complement less than 100 per cent?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is exactly it. I am coming to that right now.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. In view of what the gentleman just stated about the need for increased personnel for the Navy, what is the gentleman's opinion as to the bill that was offered by the administration at the last special session, and passed, providing that only one half the graduates of the Naval Academy should be commissioned?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I was thoroughly in accord with the bill, because we had more officers than we had ships. Now, we are building the ships and as soon as we get the ships we will have to have officers. We do not want the officers until we get the ships for them.

Mr. MOTT. That is true.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And if the gentleman will help us get the ships, then we will have sufficient officers to man them.

Mr. HEALEY. Will the gentleman answer my question now?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I only have a few minutes remaining, I must finish first and then I will answer questions.

The problem then becomes largely that of providing in sufficient numbers the officers and men without whom the material is worthless. They must be especially trained in many fields. In the recruit, it takes a long time to acquire not only familiarity with the use of a particular weapon or instrument or piece of machinery but also with the habits and customs of the organization which he has joined. He must learn the relationship of the other parts of the ship to his own so that he may be able to take over the duties of someone else who has been disabled.

To develop such proficiency requires much time and still more is needed to retain it. After a thoroughly efficient man-of-war's man has been developed, you cannot store him as you do with guns and ammunition. To retain his skill, continued practice is demanded. That is why there

must be a succession of maneuvers and drills and gunnery exercises.

The personnel of the Navy is not surpassed in excellence or in technical skill by any corresponding body of men in the world. Time after time, from the earliest days of the Republic, this branch of the service has faced crises and emergencies with never an incident of which we should not be proud. It will be many a long day before the cities of southern California forget the quickness and resourcefulness and general competence with which the battle fleet brought order out of the chaos caused by last spring's earthquake at Long Beach. The Navy develops good citizens and it instills loyalty, devotion to duty, and energy in officers and men alike.

The difficulty is that we have not enough of such men. In the attempt to reduce governmental expenditures, the number of enlisted men has gradually been reduced until now we have somewhat less than 79,000 instead of the number of 137,485 which is authorized by law. This has made it necessary to reduce the complements of ships below the danger point. Ships are being operated with crews that are entirely inadequate. The guns are not properly manned and the ships cannot steam at their maximum speed. Because of insufficient personnel, we are now operating some 30 destroyers with only 40 percent of the proper complement, in what is called a rotating reserve. The larger ships in active commission now have about 80 percent of their assigned complements.

Of course it is obvious that we cannot, in time of peace, maintain the Navy on a war footing. I feel strongly, however, in the present state of world affairs, that the ships of the active United States Fleet must have sufficient personnel to be ready to meet an emergency. This means that they must have not less than 85-percent complement, and they must be trained to the highest state of efficiency. To do this will require for the fiscal year 1935 a minimum of 85,000 men. For 1936 to provide for ships now building, which will then be ready to go in commission, that number must be increased to 93,000 men; for a peace-time treaty Navy, with only the minimum of auxiliary vessels, somewhere between 105,000 and 115,000 men. Then, if the need for mobilization should come, expansion could be carried on without destroying the readiness for battle which had previously been developed. Unless trained crews are made available, the building of ships is a futile gesture, misleading to our own people, and of very doubtful support to the national policies. Never again can we count on the assistance of some other fleet for a year or more while our own is being made ready. [Applause.]

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. In view of what the gentleman has just stated, does the gentleman still say it was proper to pass that bill at the last session, reducing the number of officers that could be commissioned in the Navy by one half?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I do, for the simple reason that we had no place for them. When we get the new ships we will have places for them.

Mr. MOTT. What is the gentleman advocating now in regard to increased personnel?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am advocating that the enlisted strength be brought up to 85,000 men, and that we have sufficient officers to man the ships in existence today.

Mr. HEALEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. HEALEY. Will the appropriation contained in this bill supply sufficient money to maintain 85,000 personnel with competent naval officers?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I do not think so. I think it has got to be increased.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. What is the consensus of opinion in the Committee on Naval Affairs with respect to the order of the President bringing the fleet from the Pacific to the Atlantic coast at this time?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The Committee on Naval Affairs does not delve into departmental matters. That is

purely a question of policy. Of course, the people on the west coast want the fleet there all the time and the people on the east coast want it here; but let me say the Navy is not based on the west coast or is not based on the east coast, but is sent where national needs require it. [Applause.]

Mr. SHOEMAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD a resolution I introduced in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWICK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN].

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, first I desire to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] on the speech he has just made. I think it is the best big-navy speech that has been made in the House in several years [applause], and I am very glad he made the speech today because he has the confidence of the Chief Executive. Any measure introduced by the gentleman from Georgia will receive kindly consideration at the hands of the distinguished gentleman now in the White House, I am sure.

The casual reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tomorrow morning when he goes through that speech will wonder just why or how under the name of Heaven a country so enlightened as ours, a country so progressive as ours, a country so rich as ours, could allow itself to fall into such decay in its national defense through the past 15 or 20 years.

Mr. EAGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. I yield.

Mr. EAGLE. Why did it do so? I am like the casual reader; I should like to know why it did.

Mr. BRITTEN. In the first place, President Harding was completely deceived by Prime Minister Balfour, who came over here in 1921 for the first disarmament conference. The pacifists of the world were calling for disarmament. Well-intentioned people everywhere were calling for military disarmament. We had, as the gentleman from Georgia so properly said, the greatest, the strongest, the heaviest-hitting group of ships the world had ever known before and we were proceeding with their construction in an orderly manner. Well, the statesmen of England—and they are great statesmen; and the diplomats of France—and they are foxy and deceitful—devised what was called the Washington Disarmament Conference. President Harding and his group of statesman swallowed the conference bait, hook, line, and sinker—someone says including the bobbin and pole. He must be a fisherman!

I recall distinctly we agreed to scrap, to destroy the very backbone of our Navy in big ships. I remember distinctly Prime Minister Balfour, a tall handsome gentleman, when we had agreed on the 5-5-3 ratio for battleships and for tonnage on airplane carriers, nothing else; Balfour stood up in the hall of the Daughters of the American Revolution and slapped his hands on his chest like this, thoroughly pleased with what he had accomplished, and he said, "This 5-5-3 ratio is going to apply in principle to all the other categories."

Mr. Chairman, they did not get together definitely on cruiser tonnage, on destroyer tonnage and on submarine tonnage because that was not what England and France wanted; they did not want to get together on those categories because in this direction they were already vastly superior to us on the seas. So the thing to do was to clip our wings where we were becoming strong, and this was in the first-line ships, the big battleships. However, following the question of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. EAGLE] Balfour had barely gotten back to England after suggesting that the 5-5-3 ratio would in principle prevail in the building of all new warships, when the British Admiralty started building more cruisers. In 7 years their cruiser tonnage was so preponderous, so superior to ours, that we were ridiculous on the high seas as far as a well-balanced first-class navy was concerned. The Washington

Conference positively wrecked the American Navy in prestige as well as in real fighting value.

President Coolidge followed President Harding. The French and British kept telling us to wait with our cruiser plans until the Disarmament Conference in Geneva had a chance to determine on cruiser tonnage. All the time they were building more cruisers, more submarines, and more destroyers of the very latest type, built after the war and, of course, incorporating in their construction the lessons learned from the experience of the war while our poor old destroyers, a couple of hundred of them, had been built in any kind of a shipyard, in very short time, and under war-time conditions, not, of course, equal to the ordinary cruiser or destroyer which we could have built under different circumstances. Most of them were used in conveying troops and supplies to France. The disarmament preparatory conference, the disarmament conference, and various conferences have been going on between 9 and 11 years, never accomplishing anything but always handing out as bait to these misguided pacifists, men and women, that it would be foolish to spend money for warships now because that conference is going to take place next year in Geneva—always next year in Geneva. Finally Calvin Coolidge, who thought he was a great trader—and I think he was—a very great President, a very sincere man, and a man who was led by high ideals of disarmament and economy, believed what they said when they told him they would meet next year in Geneva and determine upon the proper limitation for cruisers, destroyers, and submarines. He was so convinced in the matter that he provided for no new construction whatever during that period.

The Coolidge Geneva Conference met and, like all of its predecessors, was a dismal failure. The President was sure he had been tricked by the European diplomats. He was bitter toward the entire outfit. He called our dear old friend Tom Butler, then chairman of the Navy Committee, down to the White House and he said: "Introduce a bill tomorrow morning to bring the Navy up to treaty strength." I do not know how many hundreds of millions of dollars that program was to cost. John Pugh over there can probably tell us. It ran about \$800,000,000. President Coolidge wanted the authorization passed at once, he was so miffed, so hurt by the deceit that was practiced upon him by these foreign powers; he was prepared to show the world that he meant business; and Butler introduced that bill.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. I yield.

Mr. McFADDEN. I happened to be in London when the bill was introduced. The headlines in the London paper said it was a \$2,000,000,000 program. The British at that time were very much disturbed about it.

I hope the gentleman will get enough time to tell the House, in the same lucid manner that he is now speaking, how we were let down at the London Conference.

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; I am coming to that.

At the time Coolidge's enormous bill was presented the country was startled by the fabulous sum suggested for the construction of warships by this economical President. Nothing came of that bill because it was what might almost be termed a spite bill—and I do not mean that in any derogatory sense to President Coolidge, but his feelings were terribly hurt.

France and England had definitely led him to believe they were prepared to agree with the United States on cruiser and destroyer and submarine tonnage at a forthcoming conference. They led him to believe that they were going to reduce armaments, at least as far as the Navy was concerned, but they had not the slightest intention of doing that any more than they have of paying their debts unless we insist upon their doing so. They do not do business that way.

Then along came Mr. Hoover, completely mystified and deceived by these proposed conferences, each succeeding

one sinking our Navy into further depths and utterly out of balance.

I talked with Mr. Hoover one day before he took the oath of office. He sent for me, as he sent for other chairmen of important committees, in order to talk about matters affecting their particular jurisdiction in the House. I had the same ideas about the Navy then that I have now. The gentleman from Georgia and I have always been together on these bills, our desire being to build up this great right arm of the national defense to a point where it is commensurate with our Nation's position in world affairs. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] has always been for that and so have I.

I talked with Mr. Hoover about construction. He said he had just talked with Ramsay MacDonald, the great labor leader of England, and that while he did not tell me so, the new President was of the opinion that Ramsay MacDonald was going to control the British Admiralty and that Mr. MacDonald, being of a pacifistic trend himself and being an economist, would certainly see that the British Admiralty recommend a reduction in ships and in expenditures for the Navy. I said: "Mr. President, I do not believe that will transpire. I am satisfied that as in the past the British Admiralty will still control the British Nation, at least insofar as building warships is concerned, because they know more about its importance than Ramsay MacDonald does." He said, "Congressman, you do not know their new form of government."

This is what led me to believe what I have just told the House. What transpired? When he became President, Mr. Hoover was so certain that Ramsay MacDonald and the rest of those Britishers would agree upon reduction of armament and would live up to their promises that he did not authorize a single new ship during his tenure of office. Franklin Roosevelt did more, as I said the other day, with the scratch of a pen for the American Navy and the national defense than has been done by all of the rest of them put together in the past 14 years. [Applause.]

Let me suggest this thought to you. Take the greatest statesmen and leaders of the world today, men like Mussolini, Hitler, and Stalin. What do they say about the prospect of war? I do not mean a war between any particular two peoples. I mean a great conflagration that is likely to be as bad or even worse than the World War. Those men and their enunciations are what is responsible for the President's remark when he came here the other day and said that he could not view with any optimism the future of world peace. The President was not optimistic concerning that possibility. Why? No one in the United States should know more about world conditions than our President does. He has a very keen, up-to-date, alert mind. He is not being bamboozled by what these fellows on the other side say, but the great statesmen of the world say that within 12 months there will be a war and that the United States will become embroiled in it; in other words, that we will not be able to keep our country out of it.

We cannot pooh-pooh what they say and conjecture: What does that Frenchman know about this situation? Or what does that Britisher know about the situation? They study world politics much more deeply than we do.

If there is anything dangerous in the atmosphere today we certainly should not neglect our first line of defense. We have the money. We are spending \$1,000,000 an hour in all sorts of artificial endeavors to kill this depression. Think of it, \$1,000,000 an hour! We are spending that much money as I talk, for various artificial means to destroy the depression and correct this terrible situation of unemployment.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ALLGOOD. The gentleman is an authority, I know, on naval affairs. What is the life of a first-line battleship, usually?

Mr. BRITTEN. Between 20 and 22 years, depending upon its upkeep and all. They regard it usually as 20 years.

Mr. ALLGOOD. So we have saved by carrying out the program of not building battleships during the last 14 or 15 years?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; we have saved money because since the World War we have not built any of those ships.

Mr. ALLGOOD. And in that way we have saved money to be applied on the national debt.

Mr. BRITTEN. For 10 years we reduced the national debt about \$1,000,000,000 a year.

Mr. ALLGOOD. And has not the perfection of the bombing plane shown the futility of spending millions of dollars on battleships?

Mr. BRITTEN. No; that statement is entirely erroneous.

Mr. ALLGOOD. I wish the gentleman would explain that statement. I have always thought that the perfection of bombing planes had kept down such a building program. I am for national defense, but I have always thought that the development of the bombing plane has shown the futility of spending millions of dollars for battleships.

Mr. BRITTEN. We are spending now \$1,000,000 an hour for artificial stimulation of trade and we are spending this money on matters of much less importance than the national defense. National defense, after all, is our very life. It is everything we have in the world, and surely nothing could be more important; and, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has very clearly pointed out, every dollar that goes into a battleship goes into some State for rubber, furniture, paint, steel, and practically everything that is manufactured in the United States, and, of course, the matter of employment of labor is also involved.

Without throwing a scare into the world that we are aiming at offense, the time to carry on this program is right now.

No nation on earth has anything that we desire by conquest. We are building 54 ships at the present time in our various Federal and private yards. Let us appropriate now more money for more ships and let us not think of saving money, as my good friend from Alabama [Mr. ALLGOOD] said a few minutes ago. While we wait on such construction we might be saving a little money, but we might be saving it at a tremendous future cost, because we need a Navy now that is completely up to date. [Applause.] You cannot make an officer in a day or in a year or in 10 years. You can prepare one for one of the lower grades, but you cannot make an officer who can go on a ship and be worth much in less than 10 years. Is war going to wait for 10 years on us?

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. McFARLANE. Does not the gentleman believe that some of the best money our country has ever spent was expended in building up the Navy to its proper strength during the administration of Theodore Roosevelt, and in the taking of our Navy around the world to let others see our first line of defense? As a peace gesture or as a matter of insurance, was not that worth more to our country than, perhaps, any other expenditure by our Government?

Mr. BRITTEN. I think it was worth 10 times what it cost.

In Europe and in Asia commerce and power go by "face", as they call it, and when they saw our great fleet, it gave them the impression that America was 10 or 15 or 20 times stronger than they had actually believed us to be. Millions of people in Europe and in Asia think we are still a young country, loaded with gold but with not much sense—and, because of our diplomacy, you can hardly blame them for feeling that way about it.

Our diplomacy during my lifetime has been exceedingly weak. I think I have known every Secretary of State in the last 22 years rather personally, and I think I have known most of the Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries of State. With one exception, and only one exception in my mind at the present moment, they were a lot of

polite, bowing, intelligent, more or less humble individuals; and I am referring to the Department of State as it is made up now. I am not including Secretary Hull, because he has not been there long enough to indicate what he is going to do; but everybody in the State Department under Secretary Hull is too polite to even think of Japan or think of France or think of England in harsh terms. This would not be diplomatic, and we must not do it. We might not be invited to the next dinner at the Embassy if we said anything that would lead our President to say something harsh, and this would be terrible. My young friend here, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], who knows everything, says I am scratched off the French list already [Laughter.] So are you, Jack.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I never was on the list.

Mr. BRITTEN. Neither was I.

We have a President in the White House who will think for himself and who is thinking for himself, and, unless I miss my guess, he is going to tell France and Belgium and Italy and England in no uncertain language just what we expect of them. [Applause.]

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PARSONS. Will the gentleman support him in the election next fall and support his program?

Mr. BRITTEN. I have been supporting his program on the floor here as strongly as has the gentleman; in fact, much stronger, because the gentleman from Illinois has not got on his feet and talked for his President as I have. [Laughter and applause.]

While I am not prepared to go into the details of the matter now, I am going to say what I intended to say at some time later in the week.

There is a clause in every one of our war-debt-funding treaties which provides that the debtor nation shall issue to the United States at any time or from time to time, at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, in exchange for all of the bonds proposed to be issued hereunder and held by the United States, definitive engraved bonds in the form suitable for sale to the public, in such amounts and denominations as the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States may request, in bearer form, and otherwise on the same terms and conditions as to dates of issue and maturity, rate or rates of interest, exemption from taxation, and the like, as the bonds surrendered on such exchange, except that the bonds shall carry such provision for repayment of principal as shall be agreed upon; provided, that if no agreement to the contrary is arrived at, any such bonds shall contain separate provision for payments before maturity, conforming substantially to the table of repayments of principal prescribed by paragraph 6 of this proposal and in form satisfactory to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, such payments to be computed on a basis to accomplish the retirement of any such bonds by 15th of December 1934. The debtor nation shall deliver definitive engraved bonds to the United States in accordance herewith within 6 months of receiving notice of any such request from the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States and pending the delivery of the definitive engraved bonds shall, at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, deliver temporary bonds or interim receipts in a form to be agreed upon within 3 months of the receipt of such requests.

Mr. Chairman, I now call upon the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, and I now call upon President Roosevelt to request of all our European debtors that the billions we now hold in our vaults in large notes, be exchanged for their bonds of small denominations which we may from time to time sell at the world market price when they become due and payable. It is not my expectation that we would ever destroy the French or the British bond market but on the contrary we would carefully preserve that market for its own best interests. The world could easily absorb the French and British annual war debt payments without the slightest effect upon their bond markets if the matter were judiciously handled.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. McFARLANE. Does not the gentleman believe we should now appoint a fact-finding commission to investigate the ability to pay of all defaulting nations?

Mr. BRITTEN. No; I think President Roosevelt will do that. I am willing to take my chances on his judgment. He is forceful and he has today the respect of the entire world. He will get all the money if it can be done, and he will get it if he insists on the exchange of the large notes that we now hold for bonds of small denominations—\$50, \$100, \$500, \$1,000.

Mr. McFARLANE. The gentleman thinks that will be done?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; I do. I hope it will be done, and I now call upon the President in this rather unprepared manner, because I expected to talk later in the week about it—I am calling upon him to request the exchange of these notes and use those new bonds as the very foundation for our financial structure. It can be done—let him demand the exchange, and each year as the 50, 60, or 70 million dollars comes due, let us sell the bonds somewhere at the regular market price. Sell the bonds of small denominations in Paris or Belgium or Italy. I hope Mr. Morgenthau will call upon the debtor nations for exchange of our large notes for small-denomination bonds, so that we can dispose of them in the open market. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS].

Mr. COLLINS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, very high regard is accorded party nominations throughout the South. Nominating contests are spirited and oftentimes bitter, but when nominations are made our citizens then forget party differences and go to the polls and vote for party nominees.

Our people have felt that party responsibility is essential and must be maintained. Accordingly every Southern State has set up ways and means of nominating candidates. In comparatively recent years the instrumentality used is the party primary. The qualifications to vote in these primaries are the same generally as the qualifications of electors prescribed in general election laws, with the added essential that the voter must be a member of the political party at whose primary he offers to vote. In most, if not all, States the State or district party committees have the right to add additional qualifications to vote in such primaries.

Party primaries came into existence because of the abuses that grew out of the old convention system. Circumstances arise, however, now and then where it is difficult, if not impossible, to use the primary to nominate party candidates, and in such cases the method used is left entirely to the governing party authority. Such statutes have been found necessary because it is believed necessary that a political party or parties have a candidate in every election whom all party affiliates can support as the party nominee.

In my own State, full respect by members of my own political party was accorded party nominations and the findings of legally constituted party organizations until the general election of 1932 for Members of Congress.

The Legislature of Mississippi passed a redistricting act. Many of our citizens were dissatisfied with it because it did not place in each of the congressional districts of the State an equal number of citizens. The validity of this law was immediately attacked in the courts. The Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi upheld its validity. Certain United States district judges held that it violated Federal statutes. The State Democratic executive committee accepted the views of the State supreme court and ordered congressional primaries by congressional districts, and congressional primaries were held by districts, and the Members of the delegation from Mississippi in this House were nominated by the voters of their respective districts.

Immediately after the holding of the primaries candidates holding themselves out as Democrats announced as candidates for Congress from the State at large in the general election in November. They contended there was no pri-

mary and criticized severely the action of the State Democratic executive committee in calling the primaries by districts. Then we saw in Mississippi a controversy arise that would have destroyed all respect for party responsibility and for party nominations in the future. Fortunately the Supreme Court of the United States advanced the case and decided it prior to the elections upholding our redistricting act.

I am firm in the belief that full respect and confidence must be accorded our party State organizations and their findings, otherwise party nominations are worthless and party organizations are useless.

With my own distasteful experience fresh in mind, upon learning of the congressional contest in the State of Louisiana I determined to investigate the facts in the controversy and the Louisiana law to satisfy myself if this case was at all similar to my own.

The essential facts relating to this contest are as follows:

Hon. Bolivar E. Kemp died June 19, 1933. About 10 days later Mrs. Kemp, his widow, announced that she would become a candidate to succeed her husband for his unexpired term. Immediately upon making this announcement her friends circulated petitions asking her to become a candidate and pledging her their support. About 35,000 persons signed these petitions. About 25,000 of them, with their addresses, were published in one or more newspapers of general circulation in the State of Louisiana. The persons signing these petitions constitute a very large part of the electorate of the district, for at the primary in which Mr. Kemp was nominated the total vote cast was 42,104.

Sometime after Mrs. Kemp's announcement, Mr. Sanders, Jr., Mr. Whitman, Mr. Silvert, and Mr. Nelson announced themselves also as candidates. Upon her announcement Mrs. Kemp requested the Governor of the State to set a date for the filling of the existing vacancy.

I have been told that the Governor stated that there would be an election held in Louisiana at an early date at which time the people of Louisiana would vote on the question of repealing the eighteenth amendment, and that when the date was fixed for this election that he would call a special congressional election for the same date.

The special election was not immediately called. Thereupon a petition for mandamus against the Governor was filed in the Federal court for the eastern district of Louisiana to compel him to call a special election to fill this vacancy. The district judge before whom the case was heard dismissed the proceedings with the announcement that the Constitution and laws of the United States impose upon the Governor full and complete discretion and authority to issue writs of election to fill such vacancies and that the courts were without jurisdiction.

At a later date a petition signed by several thousand citizens of the district was presented to the Governor, requesting and demanding that he order an election to fill this vacancy "in order that the Sixth District may have a Representative in the coming session of Congress."

After a lapse of a few days the Governor called the election. His proclamation was dated November 27, and the date set to hold the election was December 5. In calling the election it is presumed that the Governor acted upon advice of the attorney general—and I am advised that the attorney general, or one of his assistants, so testified.

Immediately upon the proclamation of the Governor the congressional executive committee, which is a subcommittee of the State central committee—an elective body—was called together for the purpose of selecting the Democratic nominees for the special election to be held December 5. The committee met in New Orleans at the headquarters of the State Democratic executive committee. A majority of its members were present in person or by proxy, and Mrs. Kemp was chosen by said committee as the Democratic nominee.

In the election of December 5 Mrs. Kemp's name appeared on the ballot as the regular Democratic nominee. No other name appears on said ballot, but there was a space on the ballot where the name of any other could be written in or voted for by the voters participating in the election.

An election was held in 9 of the 12 parishes. It was not held in 3 of them because an injunction was issued by Judge Tycker, of the Twenty-first Judicial District Court of Louisiana, enjoining the election officials from distributing the ballots. Other efforts were made to discourage the voters from participating in the election in many of the parishes comprising the district. An excess of 5,000 votes was polled, practically all of them voted for Mrs. Kemp. In such elections the vote is rarely as much as 5,000, and has been as low as 3,000, so I am advised. Mrs. Kemp having received the greatest number of votes cast in said election, and the result having been certified to the secretary of the State, the Governor issued his certification of election of Mrs. Kemp to the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives.

Certain citizens of the district, constituting themselves into an organization known as the "Citizens' Election Committee of the Sixth Congressional District of the State of Louisiana", called an election to fill the same vacancy and fixed the date for their election at December 28, and at this citizens' election committee's election Mr. J. Y. Sanders, Jr., received the largest number of votes cast in the election, and the citizens' election committee transmitted to the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives a certification of election of Mr. Sanders.

These are the facts as they have come to me. The only ones that are of prime importance are:

First. That the election was called November 27.

Second. That the date of the election was fixed at December 5.

Third. That on November 27, at 4 p.m., the congressional executive committee, a subcommittee of the State central Democratic executive committee, met in the city of New Orleans, at the headquarters of the State Central Committee, and selected Mrs. Kemp as the Democratic nominee to be voted for in the special election to be held December 5.

Fourth. That the ballots issued in the special election provided space on which the name or names of other candidates could be written in and voted for.

Fifth. That certain citizens of the district ordered another election to fill this vacancy and certified the result of said alleged election to the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives.

Section 31 of the Revised Statutes of the United States is as follows:

Before the first meeting of each Congress the Clerk of the next preceding House of Representatives shall make a roll of the Representatives-elect, and place thereon the names of those persons, and of such persons only, whose credentials show that they were regularly elected in accordance with the laws of their States, respectively, or the laws of the United States.

Accordingly, the Clerk of the House made a roll of Representatives, and the name of Mrs. Kemp appeared upon the roll as the Member-elect from the Sixth District of Louisiana. Upon the convening of the House, however, Mrs. Kemp's name was not called, nor was it included in the list of Members-elect furnished to the Speaker in a communication from the Clerk of the House, dated January 3, 1934. In another communication to the Speaker, the Clerk of the House transmitted a certificate of election of Mrs. Kemp and also transmitted a communication from the so-called "Citizens' Election Committee." This letter is as follows:

HON. HENRY T. RAINEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I transmit herewith a certificate of election of Mrs. Bolivar E. Kemp, Sr., to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. Bolivar E. Kemp, from the Sixth Congressional District of the State of Louisiana, attested by the seal and by the secretary of state of the State of Louisiana.

I also transmit herewith a communication from the Citizens' Election Committee of the Sixth Congressional District of the State of Louisiana, in the form of a certificate of election of Hon. J. Y. Sanders, Jr., to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. Bolivar E. Kemp, from Sixth Congressional District of the State of Louisiana.

Yours very truly,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

After the reading of this letter the following resolution was offered and adopted and referred to the Committee on Elections No. 3:

House Resolution 202

Resolved, That the question of prima facie as well as the final right of Mrs. Bolivar E. Kemp, Sr., and J. Y. Sanders, Jr., contestants, respectively, claiming a seat in this House from the Sixth District of Louisiana, be referred to the Committee on Elections No. 3; and until such committee shall have reported in the premises and the House decided such question, neither of said contestants shall be admitted to a seat.

On Saturday last, January 20, the Chairman of the Committee on Elections No. 3 filed the committee's report. The report in substance denies to Mrs. Kemp the right to be treated as a Member-elect and sworn in as a Member upon her certificate of election from proper authority. It also holds that the election was not properly called, and is therefore null and void. It makes certain criticisms of the manner of calling the election and the constituted authorities of the State. It also denies to Mr. Sanders a seat and holds that the so-called "election" held by the citizens' committee was no election and therefore is null and void.

In presenting what I consider the law in this case, I shall discuss only the legal phases of the controversy. I am in nowise concerned with factional differences that concern the people of Louisiana. The membership of this House wishes to do equal and exact justice by each of these contestants and at the same time uphold the precedents of this House in its consideration of such cases.

Under the terms of the resolution there are two questions to be decided: I. The prima facie right of Mrs. Kemp to be sworn in as a sitting Member of this House. II. The final right of Mrs. Kemp or Mr. Sanders to be seated as a Member of this House.

I

The first of these questions is of the utmost importance to the membership of this House. To my knowledge, it has been an unbroken custom of the House, except for a short time during the Civil War period, to seat a Member-elect upon a prima facie showing after the certificate was shown complete and legal. Mr. William McKinley, of Ohio, in the case of Ezra B. Taylor, seated by the House on December 13, 1880, stated that Mr. Taylor's "prima facie right to be sworn in was perfect, the certificate raising no doubt as to its completeness and legality." The only cases to be found where Members-elect with proper credentials were denied seats as sitting Members are those (1) where the qualifications of the Members-elect were questioned, or (2) their loyalty to the Government of the United States attacked in times of war, or (3) because of other personal ineligibilities. Even the Civil War cases cannot be properly cited in this case.

In these cases Confederate troops occupied a large part of the territory where the elections were held and the House of Representatives was of the opinion that under such circumstances the credentials were not in proper form, were from improper persons, and perhaps were issued under fear and coercion. No such question is involved in this case.

I invite the Membership of this House to investigate Hinds' Precedents of the House of Representatives on this subject, and especially pages 766 and 767 of volume 6. In one instance the House gave prima facie effect to credentials, although there appeared a question as to the regularity of the writs of election (vol. 1, sec. 328).

Another case holds a vacancy in a contested seat being filled by a special election, the House seated the new Member on his credentials, but held that his final right must depend on the issue of the contest (vol. 1, sec. 735).

Another is to this effect: The Senate gave immediate prima facie effect to regular credentials, although a memorial impeached the regularity and legality of the election (vol. 1, sec. 551).

There is only one safe policy for this House to pursue, and that is to accept the Governor's certificate. The Governor is the State's chief executive. He is usually a man of high standing and character, and therefore no better authority can be selected upon which to issue these certificates.

Grave dangers will arise if we depart from the unbroken custom of this House and put the responsibility for the seating of Members in the discretion of a Clerk whose very position as Clerk can depend upon the rolls of the House that he is charged with preparing. It is far better to leave the responsibility of issuing certificates of election to the Governors of our respective States and then give full force and credit to these certificates. If it is found that fraud has been practiced in an election a majority vote of the House can later unseat the Member.

If the practice of denying a seat to Members whose credentials are in proper force is begun, a minority membership of this House, with a friendly Clerk can, under certain contingencies, prevent an organization of the House by the majority. This House does not want to bring about a situation which will permit such misuse and abuse of authority.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIFFORD. I would like to ask the gentleman if it was not proper for the House itself to determine the prima facie question on the first day of the session, and if it is not a fact that the committee were instructed to determine the prima facie question as well as the ultimate right?

Mr. COLLINS of Mississippi. I believe the House should have seated Mrs. Kemp upon her prima facie showing. Her credentials were in regular form.

II

Permit me now to talk to you about Mrs. Kemp's final right to retain a seat in this House.

Upon the death of Congressman Kemp a vacancy in the House from the Sixth District of Louisiana occurred. The Constitution of the United States, clause 4 of section 2 of article I, provides that—

When vacancies happen in the Representatives of any State, the executive authority thereof shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies.

Section 2713 of the Louisiana General Statutes provides:

In case of vacancies in said office of Representative in Congress between the general elections, it shall be the duty of the Governor, by proclamation, to cause an election to be held according to law to fill such vacancies. Elections shall be held in the precincts and at the polling places hereinafter defined and hereinbelow directed to be established (act 1916, no. 130, sec. 6).

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I think the gentleman has misquoted the law.

Mr. COLLINS of Mississippi. I am reading it just exactly as it is.

Mr. WILSON. The gentleman says that the Governor shall call the election according to law, and it does not specify the time. It is according to the law of the State, which provides it shall be preceded by a primary.

Mr. COLLINS of Mississippi. The Constitution of the United States and the laws of Louisiana nowhere require nominating primaries in such cases as this. The gentleman does not properly interpret the statute he has in mind. It merely provides that when primaries are ordered 10 days must elapse between the call and the election. This cannot mean there must be a primary.

Mr. WILSON. The gentleman will have to show something absolutely contrary to the law in the State of Louisiana.

Mr. COLLINS of Mississippi. There is no restriction upon the Governor in calling elections to fill vacancies in Congress. He can call the election when he sees fit. The 10-day provision that the gentleman has in mind relates to the first primary. There could be a second one, and, in all, 62 days would be the required time that should elapse, if the gentleman's contention is correct.

It will be observed that both the Constitution of the United States and the Louisiana election laws confer upon the Governor complete authority to issue writs of election to fill vacancies in Congress. There is no restriction whatever upon the executive. He can call the election at any time that he sees fit. There is no authority conferred by the Constitution of the United States or the statutes of Louisiana upon any other person or persons whatsoever to call elections

to fill vacancies in Congress. In the instant case, because the Governor of Louisiana failed to immediately call an election to fill the vacancy of Congressman Kemp, one of the candidates filed a petition for mandamus before a Federal district judge in New Orleans to compel the Governor to call an election to fill such vacancy. The district judge, recognizing the plain language of the Constitution of the United States and the election laws of the State of Louisiana, dismissed the proceedings, holding that both the Constitution and the laws of Louisiana confer this duty exclusively upon the Governor, but without mandate as to when he must act. My own opinion is that even if the Louisiana election laws did require the Governor to call an election within a given period of time, the election laws would be in conflict with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States and therefore null and void.

The Louisiana election laws dealing with vacancies in the office of Representatives in Congress are in no wise in conflict with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States but follow the language of the Constitution. It is the opinion of every court or authority that has given the question any serious study, that the Governor can call an election in 2 days, a week, a month, 3 months, or within any other time that suits him. It is even contended that he could refuse to call an election at all, and this has been done in many instances. The objection that has been raised by the House committee, if I understand the language of the report, is that sufficient time was not given for the holding of the election so that a primary could be held between the date of the proclamation of the Governor and the date of the holding of the election. This contention is wholly without merit as will be observed by an examination of McCrary on elections, paragraphs 185 and 186, as follows:

In the case of McKune against Weller, the question whether a proclamation giving notice of the holding of a special election held to fill a vacancy caused by the death of an incumbent was necessary to the validity of such election is discussed at length. The authorities upon the subject are there reviewed with care, and the conclusion is reached that there is an important distinction to be observed between general and special elections. The time, place, and manner of holding the former being fixed by law, the electors may and indeed must take notice of them, and as to such elections the statutory requirement of public notice by proclamation or otherwise may be regarded as directory only. But it was held that the statute requiring the Governor to issue his proclamation of election "to fill vacancies" which occur not in the ordinary way by the expiration of the term, but by death or resignation before the term expires, is mandatory and an essential prerequisite to all such election.

It was held by the House of Representatives of the United States, after an exhaustive discussion, that where the legislature of the State has failed to provide the time, place, and manner of holding an election to fill a vacancy occurring in the House, that the Governor of such State, upon being informed of the vacancy, may issue a writ of election and therein fix the time and places of holding such election. (See case of John Hoge of Pennsylvania, Clarke and Hall. Contested elections in Congress.) The power given to the Governor by the second section of the first article of the Constitution of the United States to issue writs of election to fill vacancies carries with it the power to fix the times and places of holding such election in cases where such times and places are not fixed by law.

It is, of course, desirable, and indeed necessary, that the proclamation be made of such election, or that it appear that it was generally known for a reasonable length of time, though in the case just referred to, it was held that a very short notice (only 2 or 3 days) was sufficient, when it appeared that the election was fixed for the same day as the election for President and Vice President of the United States, and where it was evident that the great mass of the electors were in fact apprised of it, and participated in it. (McCrary on Elections, 4th ed., pp. 138-139.)

In the instant case I dare say that everybody in the Sixth Congressional District of Louisiana knew that an election for Congressman was to be held on December 5, 1933. The newspapers were filled with news about it. The very fact that one of the judges issued an injunction against the holding of the election in three parishes of the district was itself evidence of the wide-spread interest the notice of the Governor's proclamation received. The judge's action in swearing in several hundred deputies to enforce his order was also well known by everybody in the district. Every citizen of the district had an opportunity to go to the polls and vote, except where prevented by said injunction, and had ample notice of the date of the election.

The Governor had the exclusive power and authority to call this election and to fix the time and places for the holding of the election. It is also plain that he had the authority to call the election within 1 week after the issuance of his proclamation. It is also equally plain that there is no other authority that has any control whatever over the matter or over his acts.

I now direct your attention to the action of the congressional executive committee in naming Mrs. Kemp as the Democratic nominee for Congress from the Sixth Congressional District of Louisiana. Under the Louisiana primary election laws a nominating primary to fill a vacancy cannot be held unless 10 days elapse from the date of the proclamation of the Governor ordering the election and the date of the primary. (Acts 1922, no. 97, sec. 9, and also sec. 2659 Louisiana General Statutes.)

With the proclamation of the Governor issued November 27, the earliest possible date that a primary could be held was December 8. There were five candidates for this office. The probabilities are that no one of the five candidates would have received a majority of the votes cast in the primary election. Under the Louisiana primary election law if one of the candidates fails to receive a majority of the votes cast in the said primary, then a second primary is ordered at which the two leading candidates become the candidates in the run-off.

Under section 2677, Louisiana General Statutes (act 1922) no. 97, sec. 27), it is provided that—

In all elections where returns are by this act provided to be made to the secretary of state, he shall immediately proceed to tabulate and compile the same, and shall within 8 days after the date of said primary election promulgate same in the official journal of the State, and shall forward under a special stamp a certified copy thereof under his signature and seal of office to the chairman of the committee ordering the primary.

This same section provides further that the second primary—

Shall be held with the same election officers and at the same places as the first primary was held 5 weeks from the date of the first primary: *Provided*, That if this day should fall on Mardi Gras, then the second primary shall be held 6 weeks from the date of the first primary.

There must elapse after the second primary sufficient time for the votes to be counted and canvassed and a report made to the secretary of state, so that he can be advised who has finally been nominated. Under this same section, 8 days is allowed for this purpose. It will be seen therefore that at least 62 days must elapse between the proclamation of the Governor calling a special election to fill the vacancy in Congress and the date set for said election before nominating primaries could be held in the State of Louisiana.

The Governor evidently realized that it was impossible for the primary to be held prior to January 1, 1934. He knew that he had only 33 days in which an election could be held to fill this vacancy.

Under the laws of the State of Louisiana a new registration of voters is automatically made every 4 years. Section 2629, Louisiana General Statutes (acts no. 1921, no. 122, sec. 15; 1926, no. 269, sec. 1), in part is as follows:

The registration of voters for each and every parish throughout the State, Parish of Orleans excepted, shall make a new and complete registration of the qualified voters of their respective parishes every 4 years, commencing on the 2d day of January 1922.

This section requires a new registration throughout the State in the year 1934. Under the Louisiana Statutes 30 days is permitted to carry out this registration. The law also provided that no person shall be permitted to register within 30 days of any general or primary election (*ibid.*).

The earliest date when an elector could be qualified in Louisiana, outside of the Parish of Orleans, would be at best March 2. Add to this the 62 days necessary for holding the primaries, we find that if the Governor waited until after the 1st of January that the earliest possible time a successor to fill this vacancy could be named would be during the early days of May, and Congress will likely be in adjournment at that time.

The Governor, of necessity, had to call an election before January 1 if one was to have been called. It is also plain that primaries could not have been held between November 27 and January 1.

How, then, did Mrs. Kemp receive her nomination, and was her nomination regular and in compliance with Louisiana primary election statutes? Acts, 1922, no. 97, section 31 (2681 Dart.), is as follows:

That all vacancies caused by death or resignation or otherwise among the nominees selected by any political party, under the provisions of this act, shall be filled by the committee, which has jurisdiction over the calling and ordering of the said primary election, and in the event that no person shall have applied to become a candidate for a political office within the time fixed by law, or the call of the committee ordering the primary, or in any other event wherein the party shall have no nominee selected under the provisions of this act, the committee calling the primary shall select the nominee for any position named in the call of the committee and shall have full authority to certify said name as the nominee of the said party: *Provided, however*, That wherever, for any reason, any contest filed in court shall not be finally decided in time to print the name of the nominee of the party upon the ticket at election, then the political party committee shall certify the name of the person who is the contestee in the suit filed, and the name of the said contestee shall be printed upon the ticket as the nominee of said political party, and no court shall have jurisdiction to enjoin such action.

Acting under the provisions of this section, the chairman of the State central committee issued his call to the congressional executive committee, which met in New Orleans at 4 p.m., November 27. Louisiana, like every other Southern State, has made provisions for the nomination of candidates by primary; but realizing that there are cases exceptional in their very nature where candidates cannot be nominated in primaries, as was so in this case, statutes have been enacted to take care of such eventualities. This section provided for (1) the filling of vacancies that have been caused by death, resignation, or otherwise after nominations have been made by primaries and before the general election is held; (2) it also provides for the nomination of party candidates where no person has offered himself as a candidate in a primary; (3) it also recognizes that there are other contingencies that can arise, so it provides "in any other event where the party shall have no nominee selected under the provisions of this act, the committee calling the primary shall select the nominee", and so forth.

It is contended by some that under the provisions of this statute a primary must have been held or called before a nomination could be made by the committee. The act does contemplate such cases. It goes further and takes care of those cases where the party does not have a nominee at all. If the contention of the gentlemen who are urging that this section is applicable only to those cases where nominees have died, and so forth, or where no persons have filed as candidates, then it would be useless and foolish to use the further language, "or in any other event wherein the party shall have no nominee selected", and so forth. We may as well recognize that the plain intentment of this section is to provide that a political party in Louisiana shall have under any and all circumstances in every election, general or special, a party nominee whom the members of that party can support in the election.

It has been stated that the language describing the committee shows that the purpose of this statute is to restrict committee nominations to vacancies occurring after nominations have been made or where no party candidates have filed as candidates. I insist that the words "calling the primary" is merely descriptive of the committee whose duty it is to make the nomination. Were it not for this descriptive language, some other congressional committee might claim the right to make the nominations.

It is plain that the committee under the circumstances had the right to make a nomination. There were five candidates. One of them had petitions filed in her behalf signed by 35,000 people asking her to become a candidate. There were about 60,000 registered voters in the district. There were 42,000 who participated in the last Democratic primary. Under the circumstances, therefore, since it is necessary for the Democratic Party to have a nominee, there was only

one choice that the committee could logically make, and that was to select Mrs. Kemp as the party nominee, and this was done, and under the circumstances I think as long as it is the committee's responsibility as the governing authority of the party that no one could complain.

The committee is an elective body, voted for as other candidates. They are public officers within the meaning of Louisiana law for party purposes. Furthermore, this same statute provides that no court shall have jurisdiction to enjoin their action. The statute was passed in 1922 by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, and it is a valid statute, and in the instant case its provisions have been followed.

In the special election no one was denied the right to become a candidate for Congress. There was ample space upon the ballot where the name or names of candidates could be written in and voted for. The setting aside of this space on the ballot was not an accident; it is provided for under Louisiana law. Section 2780 (acts 1916, no. 130, sec. 73; 1932, no. 160, sec. 1) provides that for a voter—

Desiring to vote for a person other than the nominee of a political party, he must write in his own hand the name of such person in the space provided for such purposes—

And so forth.

The person desiring to become a candidate by this method must announce himself as a candidate at least 3 days before the election, and he must file with the clerk of the court of the parish in which he resides a statement that he is a candidate.

Similar statutes appear in the laws of many States. Frequently candidates are elected in such ways. I remember very distinctly down in Memphis in the early political years of my good friend Congressman Ed CRUMP that he and his friends elected in this way a candidate named Reight. For a long number of years afterward he and his associates were referred to by their political enemies as "Reight writers."

The election called by certain citizens of this district under which Mr. Sanders claims a seat was without any legal authority whatsoever. The Constitution of the United States reposes this duty and responsibility exclusively in the Governor.

I do hope that my colleagues will investigate for themselves the facts and the law in this case. There are too many serious questions involved in this contest. Our own right to be seated after proper credentials have been presented by us is one of them. The others are equally serious and outstanding.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute more.

Mr. COLLINS of Mississippi. I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Wilson].

Mr. WILSON. I just want to ask the gentleman relative to the certification by the committee of a nomination on a ticket, whether in every exception he read there, if that did not occur after the primary had been ordered according to law.

Mr. COLLINS of Mississippi. No.

Mr. WILSON. And no name appearing on the ticket?

Mr. COLLINS of Mississippi. I do not understand the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON. Where the democratic committee certified a nominee on a ticket, every exception was after the primary had been called, and there was no nominee on the ticket. Is not that what the law says?

Mr. COLLINS of Mississippi. No.

Mr. WILSON. The gentleman did not read the law.

Mr. COLLINS of Mississippi. The gentleman is very much mistaken. I imagine I know as well as anyone the law in this case. I have dispassionately discussed it and other Louisiana laws. I am not concerned with factional differences in Louisiana.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. SWICK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I listened with a high degree of interest to the rather distressing prophecies made by my genial colleague from Illinois relative to the next war, and I have listened to his solicitude for a Navy second to none. I am in accord with his sentiment, but I am wondering, after all, whether in dealing with millions and millions of dollars to fabricate instrumentalities of death, the human heart has gotten so encrusted that we cannot think a little bit about those who are going to be the victims of those instrumentalities of destruction. I refer particularly to the controversy that began in the morning press in Washington between the distinguished general who presides over the destinies of the Veterans' Bureau and the national commander of the American Legion. I want to relate it briefly to the independent offices appropriation bill, with a legislative section, that was passed in this chamber a week or two ago.

I understand there has been introduced in the body over at the other end of this Capitol, a bill by Senator GEORGE embodying the 4-point program of the American Legion. At the same time there has been introduced over there an amendment by Senator REED, of Pennsylvania, that embodies the same program. I understand also that the Parliamentarian of the Senate has indicated that it is perfectly proper to introduce the Reed amendment to the independent offices appropriation bill, provided the subject matter of that amendment is germane to the bill. In the event the Vice President or the Presiding Officer overrules the contention that it is germane, he can, in turn, be overruled by that body, by a simple majority. In a secret poll that was conducted in the Senate on the 18th of January, I understand there are enough votes in the Senate to overcome any adverse ruling by the Presiding Officer; so that, in substance, a simple majority will be able to write the Reed amendment into the independent offices appropriation bill. That may have been the reason why the majority leader of the Senate rushed to the White House on the afternoon of January 18—

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order against the speech being made by the gentleman. I do not want to disturb him. The gentleman may not be familiar with the rules, and I mean no discourtesy, but it is clearly in violation of the rules of the House for a Member either in the House or in Committee to refer to votes or actions or positions of Senators in the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That part of my remarks may be expunged if it is not in accord with the rule, but it simply gives the background to what I am leading up to.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LANHAM). The Chair will read the provision in Jefferson's Manual with reference to this matter:

It is a breach of order in debate to notice what has been said on the same subject in the other House, or the particular votes or majorities on it there; because the opinion of each House should be left to its own independency, not be influenced by the proceedings of the other; and the quoting them might beget reflections leading to a misunderstanding between the two Houses.

The Chair is constrained, under these circumstances, to sustain the point of order. The gentleman will please proceed in order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well. That is only a background to the thing I have in mind, and that is the subject matter of the Reed amendment, which embodies the 4-point program, designed first of all to restore pay to service-connected disabled veterans who have been cut off under the provisions of the Economy Act; secondly, to restore, or rather, in the first instance, to grant to widows and orphans, irrespective of whether they are widows and orphans of those who died from service-connected disability or not, of a Federal pension; and, third, the program of hospitalization, whereby those ex-service men who are in distress and have no money with which to pay for hospitals, shall have a right to go to existing facilities, irrespective of that fact and irrespective of whether their disabilities are service-connected

or not; and, finally, the fourth point of that program is to reestablish service connection for those presumptive cases that were wiped from the rolls through the instrumentality of the Economy Act. General Hines takes exception to the program, and he has submitted a brief of figures. The American Legion leadership has submitted a brief of figures, and apparently there is a variation of several million dollars. I am not going to be so ungracious as to publicly characterize General Hines as an unmitigated liar, even though I believe so, but I do believe that he has been so grossly careless with figures that he might qualify as a charter member of the Ananias Club. [Applause.]

When the program of the American Legion has figures that have been submitted, and we compare them with the figures that emanate from the Veterans' Bureau, showing that General Hines has made a mistake before the joint committee before, of millions and millions of dollars, I submit that we have a right, as a matter of fact, to cherish some incredulity as to the figures that come from the Veterans' Bureau now.

Now, that is the program of the American Legion. Let us look at the regulations that were issued by the White House last Saturday afternoon to ascertain precisely how close they come to it. It seems to me we have been asking for a dog from the White House and we got a tail. That is about all, that is represented by the twenty-one-odd million dollars, supposedly allocated to veterans' benefits, starting, first of all, with the restoration of the basic pay in all grades; from nine to ten dollars, from eighteen to twenty dollars, and from ninety to a hundred; but I submit, and I want it clearly borne in mind by everyone in this chamber, that that provision does not restore a single disabled ex-service man to the disability rolls; not one. If you had gotten that idea about it from those regulations, you might just as well dismiss it from mind, because not a single soldier is going to be restored to the rolls, nor are they going to repay or reimburse them for the 25 percent that was taken away from the service-connected veterans under the provisions of Public, No. 2, better known as the Economy Act.

Mr. SHOEMAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SHOEMAKER. Does the gentleman know that out of this \$21,000,000 the pension is to be increased to the officers' widows but not to the widows of privates?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand that is true. Now, item no. 2, of significant import where veterans of the World War are concerned, is the so-called "hospitalization feature." Let me impress upon you now that this additional regulation does not give the veteran a single thing he does not already enjoy under present regulations. All it does is to make available an additional \$8,000,000. For what purpose? Why? Simply to give transportation to those who may be admitted to hospitals under present regulations; but in this respect it does not broaden the hospitalization privileges the veteran already enjoys.

One other thing in the program: They increased the burial allowance from \$75 to \$100. There is something ironic to me about that, because they wait until the veteran is taken from the face of the earth before they allow an additional \$25 to take him away in a rough box, something altogether ironical, I should say about this \$21,000,000 veterans' provision that it is expected to appease them at the present time for all the losses they suffered under Public Act No. 2.

There is also a provision that total permanent service-disabled veterans need not particularly prove 90 days of service to get the \$30 per month. How generous, I should say, to those who are infirm in mind or body, from whom has been taken away total capacity to earn a living! We are going to say to them: "You do not have to prove 90 days of military service in order to get a niggardly \$30 a month under this additional regulation." This is expected to appease the ex-service man and probably allay some of

the hostility and the growing resentment that may have appeared in both bodies here on Capitol Hill.

Let me refer just once more to this hospitalization feature because those regulations will appear in the pages of the metropolitan press and the readers will say, "Well, what the devil does the ex-service man want now; has not the President been liberal; has he not given him additional hospitalization facilities; has he not given him an increase in pay?" And the undiscerning person, unfamiliar with the intricacies of veterans' regulations, will read these new regulations on the front pages of the newspapers and then consider the veteran an ingrate without analyzing just how far these new regulations go.

You remember what our President said before the American Legion Convention in Chicago. He stood there and said:

No man, because he wore the uniform, shall be the special beneficiary of this Government.

To elaborate, he said that they must exhaust first of all every opportunity for local and State relief before they can knock on the door of the Federal Government and say, "Oh, Uncle Sam, please come to the rescue." What does he have to do even now under this extended regulation? He must virtually take an oath that he is a pauper. Mind you, the defenders of the Nation have got to go down and grovel abjectly in the dust and say, "Uncle Sam, I have been to the municipality where I was born and reared and they are out of money; I have been to the State where I was born and reared and to which I owe allegiance and they are out of money. They are out of relief funds; and so now I come, somehow sublimating all self-respect, and say I am a pauper; and now, please, Uncle Sam, will you aid me?"

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Will the gentleman please insert in the Record Theodore Roosevelt's statement?—

War veterans have a greater claim upon us than any other class of our citizens.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would gladly do it, but I may say to the gentleman from Minnesota that I prefer not to make a partisan issue of the desires of the veterans. That is not fair; why should they be sacrificed upon the altar of partisanship?

I yield to no one in my loyalty to the infirm man who sits in the White House and presides over the destinies of this Nation, but is that any reason why we cannot criticize if we honestly believe that we have not been securing justice for the defenders of the Nation, whose memories are sacred to every man who wore the uniform and soldiered for that flag over on the other side of the ocean? I do not want to bring Theodore Roosevelt into it, irrespective of what his opinion might have been.

Mr. WEIDEMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WEIDEMAN. Will the gentleman not also add that General Hines was not a product of this side of the House?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I hold no brief for General Hines, I may say to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHOEMAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SHOEMAKER. Does the \$21,000,000 include anything for Spanish-American War veterans and their widows?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; it provides for \$15 per month where he has had 90 days' service and can show an honorable discharge, which, as a matter of fact, was no improvement over present regulations; and it also provides \$15 per month where his service was less than 90 days and where he shows a 50-percent disability. The only thing that is changed over and above the old regulation is the fact that he does not have to show that he is 55 years of age. However, it does provide a little something additional for the Spanish War veteran, I should say.

I am kicking very particularly because it is such a meager response to the demands and to the needs of the veterans of the Nation, and I have a right to believe in my own heart that it is given as something of a sop to head off the growing revolt. But let me say to every Member in this Chamber if he thinks for a minute that the veterans of the country are simply going to supinely accept these little gratuities which fall like crumbs from the table to Lazarus, that he will be sadly mistaken. These piecemeal extensions will be the greatest incentive that the Nation's veterans ever had to fight for the things they deem just and right and to demand rather than petition in behalf of the widow, the orphan, the service-disabled veteran, and particularly for hospital treatment for the one whose disabilities are nonservice connected and who has no funds with which to pay for hospital treatment.

We made a survey of some hospitals in Illinois. There were 1,800 veteran patients. We found about 1 percent who had the money to pay for private care or for private hospital treatment.

When the body is torn with pain and anguish, what comfort is it to the man who wore the uniform to have Uncle Sam say: "I know how you languish and suffer; I know you have no money with which to have pain assuaged or secure adequate treatment, but what do I care? The war was fought 15 or 16 years ago and has become a second-hand memory to those of this generation, to be read of in history books and schoolbooks. I have forgotten all that, and you must find help the best you can, even though you may be one of the 10,000,000 or 11,000,000 who belong to the great distressed army of unemployed."

I want to summarize. I want this kept clearly in mind. Understand that these regulations that were issued Saturday do not put a single additional veteran, outside of a few Spanish-American War veterans, back upon the roll. They do not restore any of the \$57,000,000 that was taken away under the Economy Act. It does nothing for the widows and orphans of the non-service-connected cases, the widows and orphans who are to be found on the highways and byways and who are in need. It does not enlarge any authority that the veterans have at the present time under existing regulations so far as hospitalization goes. So when you voice approval for that additional \$21,000,000, be not misled that it will do anything material for the veterans.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, it has been my pleasure on several occasions to speak in this Chamber concerning some of the unique and entrancing features of the history of Texas. The story of that Lone Star State is one of mutual interest to us all because its destiny as a Republic and as a State was wrought by citizens from all sections of the United States as the United States then existed. In the July 1933 number of the United States Naval Institute's proceedings appears an illuminating article by Mr. Robert Foster Carter with reference to the navy of Texas. In my judgment, the results of his research should be given wider publicity and included in the annals of our sea experiences. I can think of no more appropriate place for remarks concerning this article to be inserted than in the record of the proceedings of the House of Representatives in the consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

Texas has been governed under six different flags—those of France, Spain, Mexico, the Republic of Texas, the Southern Confederacy, and the United States. It is my purpose to speak of the navy of that great State, especially during the time when Texas was a Republic, because it was then and then only that it could have and maintain its own separate naval force.

In its experiences with Mexico, Texas had suffered many indignities. It looked to the ascendancy of Santa Ana as a source of relief from those indignities, but unfortunately the massacres and atrocities which followed his induction into office, and continued for many years, left those Texans,

Americans from all sections of our land, in a worse condition than that which prevailed under the previous tyrant. This led, as you know, to their declaration of independence and to the subsequent establishment of that independence upon the field of battle.

In the latter part of 1835, Mexico, having rather a large navy for a country of its importance, because of the fact that although it had established its independence of Spain, the desire still lingered in the hearts of those of the mother country to recapture this great territory, sent out a Mexican vessel of war named the *Correo Mexicana* for the purpose of enforcing revenue laws. That vessel was sent to Anahuac on the Bay of Galveston, but the Englishman in charge of it soon overstepped his orders and his ship became a privateer. It made an attack upon the American brig *Tremont*, which was defenseless and which was engaged in unloading lumber at one of the ports on the Gulf. A Texan-owned ship, the *San Felipe*, flying, of course, the Mexican flag, went out to the relief of the *Tremont*. The *San Felipe* appeared to be an ordinary vessel of the sea, but when it turned about and disclosed its armament it was a veritable gunboat, and succeeded in conquering the Mexican vessel engaged in this piratical cruise.

About this time, Texas, because of the indignities heaped upon it, began to promote the establishment of its independence from Mexico, and shortly thereafter at San Jacinto, after the massacres at Goliad and the Alamo, made that independence a positive fact. So Texas became a republic, and for 9 years it maintained that status.

One of the first acts of the Republic was to increase the naval forces which had been provided by the provisional government in 1835. In addition to this captured Mexican ship, the provisional government purchased four fighting schooners, the *Liberty*, the *Independence*, the *Brutus*, and the *Invincible*, small to be sure, but they proved their worth in many serious naval engagements. When the Republic was established, 10 or 15 additional ships were added to the naval force. But shortly thereafter and despite the fact that \$280,000 had been appropriated for still other fighting vessels, the Congress of the Republic ordered the entire navy to be retired.

It so happened that for a time this could be done without serious consequence, because France, holding certain debts against the Mexican Government, blockaded its coast until the payment of those debts was insured. In 1839, when that blockade was lifted and Texas as a Republic again became menaced by Mexico, because it was always seeking to reclaim that vast empire as its own, Texas joined forces, morally at least, with Yucatan, which, following the example of Texas, sought also to establish its independence. Nominally, Texas could aid only morally by reason of the fact that commissioners were then in Mexico negotiating a treaty of peace, but that moral limit, sometimes overstepped, was of great interest and advantage to Yucatan and some funds were forthcoming from that country to help the Texans in maintaining their fleet. So the previous order of the Congress of the Republic to retire the navy was disregarded, and President Mirabeau B. Lamar, in a message to the Congress, made this significant statement, which I am sure will be interesting to such friends and colleagues of mine in the House as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTON]:

The naval equipments of a country, and especially of this country, are essentially different in the facility of their organization from the military power. Competent officers and soldiers to constitute an army may at any time be selected from the body of the population, but seamen and efficient naval officers are not to be found among a rural people; they belong to the element on which they serve, and are nurtured only on the ocean waves.

So by reason of the trouble in Yucatan, in which those people were aided and abetted by the moral support and the naval force of the Republic of Texas, the new Texan nation was saved from further encroachment by the Mexican Government.

Then came the third period in the history of the Texan Navy. In 1845, the Republic was admitted to the United

States as a State of the American Union and, as showing the universality of the importance and interest of Texan history from an American standpoint, the man most responsible for that annexation was the last president of the Republic of Texas, Anson Jones, who hailed from Massachusetts. In my judgment, his policy of apparently and ostensibly seeking to join Texas either with France or with England as a dependency of one or the other country, led the United States to claim that vast domain as its own, and since that time it has been a State of the American Union.

When Texas entered the Union, it retained its land; but it ceded to the Union its Navy, with all the appurtenances thereunto appertaining, its fortifications, and its barracks; and a controversy then arose as to whether or not the officers went with the ships and thereby became officers of the American Navy. The sentiment in Congress, originally and primarily, was to the effect that they should become officers of the American Navy, but some of those of high rank in naval circles protested against this and formed an adverse lobby because of the fact that certain officers of the Texan Navy had formerly held much inferior rank in the American Navy, and they did not wish them transferred with the high rank to which they had ascended in the regime of Texas. As a consequence, the ships only, without the men, became a part of the Federal Navy, but in 1857 the Congress of the United States did recognize for the American Government the worth of the service which had been rendered and granted 5 years' pay to the officers of the Texas Navy. In addition to this, the Republic of Texas—and after Statehood the Legislature of Texas—gave certain financial and other recognition to these valiant men.

Though these ships were small, they contributed some very interesting chapters to the naval history of this country; and manned as they were by red-blooded Americans from every section of our land, they proved valiantly in many encounters the stern stock from which they sprang, winning victories over forces apparently overwhelming, just as they did on land when at San Jacinto a little handful of men under Gen. Sam Houston established the independence of Texas.

It is worthy of note in this connection that during the time the Texan Navy, which subsequently became a part of the Navy of the United States, was operating, Mexico was unable to land from its vessels one single soldier on Texas' shores or to unload supplies for its vastly more numerous army, but the ammunition and the various supplies sent by water to the Texan fighters from various parts of the United States arrived safely; and so, added to the great American triumphs on land in this Lone Star State, we have equally significant, although relatively unknown, triumphs by sea; and in view of the fact that from your section, whatever that section may be, brave men came to make these victories possible, and in view of the fact that the accomplishments of that small navy were American accomplishments, I thought it quite worth while to insert in our proceedings with reference to the naval appropriation bill this interesting bit of Texan and American history. [Applause.]

Mr. SWICK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey, [Mr. SEGER].

Mr. SEGER. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Committee, the gentleman from Illinois, answering a question today, agreed that an ocular demonstration is most effective to carry a point. I believe this is emphasized in a letter I have recently received from a Jerseyman anent the St. Lawrence waterway project. I believe it to be of interest to the House, and especially my colleague from New York, our minority leader, who is a leading exponent of this project and who last week rejected many of the arguments advanced against the waterway project by the Atlantic deeper waterways convention at Philadelphia, whose 500 delegates came from a territory embracing two thirds of our country's population and 80 percent of its taxpayers. My correspondent is Maj. Leslie E. Molineux, of Metuchen, N.J., and the theme of his epistle is: "We should keep our eyes open." The letter is short. I read it with your indulgence:

METUCHEN, N.J., January 16, 1934.

Hon. GEORGE N. SEGER,

House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: An Associated Press dispatch reports that you oppose the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Deep Waterway Treaty. It is hoped that you will be successful in defeating it.

There are two strong natural obstacles to the project; fog and ice. Navigation from Montreal to Europe is difficult all of the year on account of fog in the long run down the St. Lawrence River to the open sea, some 800 to 1,000 miles. The port of Montreal is closed during the winter months on account of ice. Have these two objections been brought to the attention of the House Committee with the strength they deserve?

The story is told that years ago when the subject of a canal across the Isthmus was before Congress there was a strong difference of opinion whether the canal should be on Colombian or Nicaraguan territory. An objection was made to the latter on account of the liability of earthquakes and volcanic eruptions. This was ridiculed by the advocates of the Nicaraguan Canal. On the morning that the vote was to be taken in the House, each Congressman received a letter containing nothing but a Nicaraguan postage stamp. The stamp showed a volcano in full eruption. The vote following was in favor of Panama.

Photographs of the ice-bound port of Montreal would be of interest. We are learning more and more through the eyes.

Yours respectfully,

(Maj.) LESLIE E. MOLINEUX.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEGER. I will.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. The gentleman understands that the fog is in the lower part of the St. Lawrence?

Mr. SEGER. I am not familiar with the locality; I am only giving you this letter.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Well, I will inform the gentleman that that is the case. The ice and fog are in the lower part of the St. Lawrence, and it has not prevented the use of that part of the St. Lawrence River for all these years. If that is true, why should the people tributary to the Lakes beyond Montreal be prevented from reaching the ocean?

Mr. SEGER. I have not the time to go into an argument with the gentleman, but I am in favor of an all-American canal.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, how much time has been used on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas has used 2 hours and 1 minute, and the gentleman from New York has used 1 hour and 37 minutes.

Mr. SWICK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I have the honor to represent a district which has diversified interests. We have one section devoted to fruit growing and one section devoted largely to dairying. I am interested in any legislation that will bring relief to the dairymen.

The dairy farmers throughout the United States have been suffering from low prices for their products for several years. Federal relief has been extended to the producers of cotton, corn, wheat, rice, and tobacco.

The effort to assist the dairymen has been nullified in a large degree because of the imports of oils and fats which have displaced dairy products in the American market. The injury these imported oils and fats are inflicting on our domestic dairy products has been called to the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture; furthermore, extensive hearings have been held at which the dairy interests have appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee, and they have shown to what extent the imports are breaking down the dairy market.

Further delay in applying a remedy will endanger the effectiveness of the relief planned under the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Before discussing the extent to which imports are affecting the dairy market, I wish to stress the importance of the dairy industry to the country as a whole.

There are 4,615,529 dairy farms in the United States. The total number of dairy cows in this country is 24,379,000, valued in 1932 at \$965,758,000. The latest figures I have been able to obtain show that the value of dairy products

per year in the United States aggregates \$1,663,772,000. The investment of the dairymen of the United States in dairy cattle, dairy farms, and dairy machinery amounts to \$6,135,887,000.

I am presenting these figures to show the magnitude of this particular farm activity with the hope of convincing the Secretary of Agriculture and the Members of this House as to the vital necessity of taking some action to protect this great farm industry from ruinous exploitation by foreign competition. I have the honor to represent a district in which the dairy industry is of paramount importance to the economic life of a very large area. To permit this industry to be destroyed by foreign competition would be a major disaster not only in the congressional district which I represent but also to the other dairy sections of the country.

Without going into great detail as to the rapid increase of competing imports from abroad, let me visualize the situation by reading these figures:

Imports

| | Palm Oil | Cocoanut oil | Whale oil |
|-----------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | <i>Pounds</i> | <i>Pounds</i> | <i>Pounds</i> |
| 1920..... | 41,948,224 | 216,327,103 | |
| 1925..... | 139,178,587 | 2,333,174,452 | 55,495,290 |
| 1928..... | 169,227,565 | 290,636,702 | 68,385,503 |
| 1931..... | 258,144,600 | 325,174,500 | 139,692,757 |

These imports come from the tropical countries where labor receives only a few cents a day. There is no class of labor in this country that could possibly exist on such wages. Each of these commodities comes into direct competition with butter facts. To put our dairy farmer in competition with such labor at any time is indefensible and to do so when he is so hard pressed is to beat him over the head when he is down and out.

For years the dairy farmer has had to compete with the imported dairy products from Canada, Denmark, and New Zealand. Finally, the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act greatly reduced this competition. It is to be hoped that the protection given under that tariff act will not be reduced or relaxed under any trade treaty.

There is a great surplus of dairy products in foreign countries seeking entrance into our market should the opportunity be offered. To permit the entrance of foreign butter, cheese, milk, and cream would mean to utterly destroy the last hope of the dairymen.

The rapid increase in the use of foreign fats and oils in this country is daily aggravating the desperate plight in which the American dairy farmer finds himself. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman is a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means. Would it not be in order for his committee to consider placing an embargo on these oils and fats and substitutes for butter and dairy products?

Mr. REED of New York. As I understand the situation at present—and this has occurred within a very few days—the Secretary of Agriculture has appointed a committee in the Bureau of Economics dealing with dairy questions to consider the whole question and to determine just how far the Secretary of Agriculture can go under the present legislation to meet the situation. It is my opinion that he will find that he has not the power to give the relief which the dairymen desire. I believe it is imperative, if we are going to save the dairy industry from complete ruin through these imports, to take some action at this session of Congress.

Whether the Ways and Means Committee will feel that it can put on an embargo or whether it can put on some form of excise tax, the committee has not yet decided; but that legislation is sorely needed, there can be no question. Not only that, but take the men who are collecting the fats from the butcher shops all over the country. Their business is being ruined, and they buy direct from the farmer. I believe most of the Members here have received petitions

and letters from that class. They take up a great deal of the fats and waste matter from the butcher shops. I have not given the whole picture. There is sesame oil imported from the Orient. The seeds are small, both white and black, and when pressed they yield at least half their weight in oil. It is an oil that does not become rancid, no matter how long it is kept. It comes into direct competition in various salads mixed with other oils, and the imports of sesame oil are increasing. Throughout Florida and many States of the South these seeds could be produced in great quantities, but it is utterly impossible to produce them with labor that receives as low a wage as labor is paid abroad. As a matter of fact these and many of the other oils, coconut oil, are produced by people who work for wages as low as 2 cents a day. Those people require practically no clothing, except possibly a breechclout; no shoes. They live on almost nothing; yet the farmers of this country, with our standard of living, are brought into direct competition with that cheap labor.

Mr. FISH. Has the gentleman's committee taken under consideration the danger to the dairy industry from the use of oleomargarine?

Mr. REED of New York. It has been called to the attention of the committee. I might say to the gentleman that in Canada during the war a law was passed prohibiting the manufacture of oleomargarine in Canada. That law is still in force. Not only that; they had a trade treaty with New Zealand and even modified that, because it was found that even New Zealand, some 2,000 miles away, was able to undercut the Canadian farmer by shipping dairy products into Canada.

Mr. FISH. Is it not a fact that oleomargarine is a considerable menace to the dairy industry?

Mr. REED of New York. There is no question about that, and that was brought out in the hearings before our committee. But that is not the whole picture. Some of the States are now producing sunflower seed in large quantities. Take also the matter of peanut oil. That is being menaced by these foreign cheap oils and seeds. Mind you, there was a tariff put on the seeds, but the hole that was left there was that foreign countries were able to bring in the seeds and press them out here. In the State of Minnesota, for instance, they have gone into the sunflower business in a large way. Russia has gone into that, and she is shipping her sunflower seed here at the present time in competition with our farmers.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Is it not true that the cotton farmer of the South would also profit by an embargo on vegetable oil from the Philippines?

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman is correct, and at this particular time the cottonseed-oil interests have appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and have shown the disaster that importation of oils is bringing to the cotton farmer. The cottonseed oil is the one cash item that a strictly cotton farmer gets from his crop. This competition is ruining his business, and they are joining with the dairy interests to get relief.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Does not the gentleman feel that the present effort to secure a reduction of acreage by paying the farmer is due to our leaving the sluiceways open for the entrance of competing products from abroad?

Mr. REED of New York. Absolutely, and the same is true in regard to the dairyman. Soon there will be a plan to reduce the amount of dairy products by limiting the amount each can produce; and just as long as the foreign countries can ship in the things that will displace our dairy products, it is doomed to failure.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. As a matter of fact, what we are doing is to place a tax on the American consumer to subsidize agricultural production abroad.

Mr. REED of New York. Yes, and even more, because if we let them come into our market, they will disorganize our business at home and we may never get it back again.

Mr. HART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes.

Mr. HART. Up to the time of the passage of the Fordney-McCumber Act was there not a restriction upon duty-free fats and oils from the Philippines?

Mr. REED of New York. Not to my knowledge. Permit me to say to the gentleman that the one and only hope the dairyman has had during the whole depression has been the high duty placed upon dairy products of foreign countries. Were it not for that, Canada would simply have flooded us with dairy products. Dairy imports would have come from Denmark and New Zealand. I want you to remember this: They can ship butter from New Zealand into New York or into San Francisco at less cost, as far as transportation rates are concerned, than they can ship it from Wisconsin to New York.

Mr. HART. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. HART. Was there not also a restriction on the importation of sugar, duty free, from the Philippine Islands until the passage of the Fordney-McCumber Act?

Mr. REED of New York. I am not familiar with that, and I am not concerned about it.

Mr. HART. We are, out in Michigan.

Mr. REED of New York. What I am concerned about is this, that there is a group of islands not far from the Philippine Islands where they have been raising spices. They have now found it more profitable to ship their oils to this country, so they have displaced thousands of acres of spice lands and are putting in the coconuts. In the Philippine Islands they are developing coconut growing at an alarming rate. A coconut tree will produce a hundred pounds of coconuts per year. They cost very little to plant. They will come into bearing in 5 or 6 years. Unless we stop this thing now it will get such a hold that our dairymen will be ruined.

The Federal Government has spent millions of dollars to eradicate bovine tuberculosis. In my particular district they have cooperated until our herds are practically all certified herds. That has been expensive. They have fine barns; they have the dairy machinery; they have been a prosperous lot of people, but today they are confronted with ruin because of these importations.

Mr. HART. I am a dairy producer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] has again expired.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KLEBERG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. KLEBERG. I would like to ask my distinguished colleague whether it has ever occurred to him that possibly this whole business of the tariff may have brought us into the position which now confronts us, not only with reference to the Philippine Islands, the Virgin Islands, the isle of Guam, and other countries where we have at one time or another exercised what might be called a protectorate.

Mr. REED of New York. If I had my way and were to establish a policy for this Government, the tariff would not be as low as it is now. It would be higher, and we would live more within ourselves than we are at the present time. I do not believe the tariff has brought about this situation at all.

Mr. KLEBERG. I do not believe my friend got exactly what I was driving at. The suggestion of a tariff, or rather the use of the word tariff, in the first place, in my opinion, might possibly have been an error. In my opinion, a nation should be willing to pay contribution toward the support of a market in any other country which they seek to use, just as one who sets up a market place and offers stalls for rent expects the individual or agency that uses one of those stalls to pay for it. In the case of a tariff structure, we cannot ask a contribution from the Philippines, because we cannot tax, through a tariff, those who are under our protection, if you please.

Mr. REED of New York. I will say to the gentleman that I voted for Philippine independence. That is one reason, and only one of several, why I voted for it, because I wanted to protect our farming interests. I believe if they come into our market they should pay for the use of it, but there is no reason for their coming here at all with their fats and oils.

Mr. KLEBERG. Suppose we were to change this tariff set-up that we have in this country and proceed to establish a policy where all nations are invited to use our markets, provided they pay the fixed overhead and charges which our producers are called upon to meet and contribute a little additional to the support of those markets?

Mr. REED of New York. I believe we can supply all of our needs along dairy lines from our own farms in this country if we will protect this market as we go along.

Mr. KLEBERG. The gentleman would not agree to a policy whereby you can call upon any nation to pay the fixed charges and a little additional, for the use of these markets?

Mr. REED of New York. I would make it so hard that it would be practically an embargo.

Mr. KLEBERG. We are not talking about what we would make it. We are talking about a policy. We could expect a contribution from every country in that way, including the Philippines, and so forth. To explain my thought: If we could throw overboard and do away with what we call "our tariff policies" and set up a policy in its stead which would provide that all countries outside of continental United States would be called upon to contribute toward the maintenance of our markets—markets that are erected and maintained by our Government for our people, and paid for by our people—other countries should, if the use of our markets by them is desired, be willing to meet the overhead fixed charges and cost of production to our producers by contributing in accordance with them toward the maintenance of such markets as well as paying the additional burdens which their added use of the market brings about. While this would in effect in most cases be the same in effect as some of our tariffs, still the idea of embargo is not of the essence.

Mr. REED of New York. I will follow any policy that will keep our markets for the dairymen of this country.

Mr. WEARIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. WEARIN. Can the gentleman give the House any information as to what percentage of fats and oils that are being imported into the United States at the present time now come from the Philippine Islands and our various island possessions?

Mr. REED of New York. I gave the amount that is coming in. I cannot give the exact percent. I did not go into that detail here. It is all disclosed in the hearings. Later on I shall go into the details further, when time will permit. There is talk that this session of Congress will not last very long. We are setting up codes for the dairymen and doing things to aid him. The only thing is to take action in time so that they are not allowed to push in boatload after boatload of these oils and fats and put down the man we are trying to aid.

Mr. WEARIN. Does not the gentleman think, however, that the policy with reference to limitations on oils depends a good deal upon the percentage of them that comes from our island possessions?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes; undoubtedly it does.

Now, discussing this question a little further, from the viewpoint of these other countries, let us consider the situation in Denmark. Denmark has a very great surplus of butter at the present time. Butter is strictly an article of export in Denmark. Through their cooperatives they make oleomargarine and the farmers eat oleomargarine to have more butter to export. They can sell their butter on our market in New York at a transportation rate which is about equal to the rail transportation rate from western New York to New York City, and this gives them a great advantage.

Let us consider also the situation in New Zealand. In New Zealand are three islands well adapted to the raising of

cattle. It is not necessary to house the cattle, for the climate is very mild. There is an abundance of moisture in that country. That makes it ideal for producing hay. They raise all sorts of turnips and herbs that the cattle eat. It is strictly an export country and its government goes throughout the world spending literally hundreds of thousands of dollars a year advertising their products, setting up their stores wherever they can. Fortunately, they cannot get into our market at the present time, because the tariff keeps them out.

While we have kept these exporting nations out, I still appeal to the Members to consider the facts with regard to the quantity of oils coming in. The testimony of the dairy interests is to the effect that imported oils are breaking down the price of dairy products in this country.

Mr. SHOEMAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. SHOEMAKER. Would the gentleman be interested to know that the butter that is being used by our Army, by our Navy, and by the Government establishment in the Panama Canal Zone comes from New Zealand instead of from our own country?

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SWICK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. CHRISTIANSON].

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Chairman, I am sure most of the Members of this House will remember a story which they read in their youth, Charles Lamb's Dissertation Upon Roast Pig. One day a Chinaman went away from home, leaving the house in charge of his young son. The boy was careless with fire, with the result that the building burned down. After the flames had wrought their work of destruction the boy remembered his favorite pig which had been kept in the house. Concerned for its welfare and safety he went to the smoking ruins saw the pig, grabbed it by a leg to rescue it from the flames. He burned his fingers and put them in his mouth. For the first time a Chinaman had discovered how tasty and delectable roast pig may be, and from that time on almost every day some Chinaman's house burned down.

This afternoon, when I heard the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, make certain statements about the effort to cure unemployment by engaging in public works, I recalled this story; and the question arose in my mind whether we are not much like the Chinamen who burned their houses down to get roast pig.

For instance, the gentleman told us that it costs the United States Government \$5,400 to keep one man employed 1 year at constructing public buildings. It seems to me the time has come when the Congress should begin to consider very seriously whether its attempt to relieve unemployment by the very expensive and extravagant method of erecting bigger and finer post offices and courthouses is justified, and whether we are making the money go as far as it should. I am strongly of the opinion that too large a proportion of the \$3,300,000,000 we appropriated for public works during the special session will enrich contractors and material men instead of buying bread, fuel, and shelter for the hungry men and women of America.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. I yield.

Mr. FISH. From what the gentleman says, it seems apparent to me that the policy of the administration has been to save a few drops at the spigot but to open up the bung-hole to a flood of expenditures which have not served any too good purpose. Is not that what the gentleman believes?

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Answering the gentleman from New York, I will say that it is not my purpose to direct any attack against the administration. I believe in Franklin D. Roosevelt. His objectives are, in the main, my own, and I have voted for most of the measures he has sponsored. When policies miscarry, when they fail to bring the bene-

ficial results anticipated, let us as Members of Congress admit our share in the responsibility. I did not vote for the public-works program for the reason that England's experience had proved that it would fail as a means of unemployment relief and for the reason that it would put a heavy burden upon the taxpayer and therefore operate as a brake on industry. I did not vote for it because I feared that labor would get only the crumbs that fell from the table. However, with all my misgivings as to the P.W.A., I believe thoroughly in the C.W.A. I believe in it because it relieves distress and makes it possible for millions of people to eat and to provide themselves with clothes, fuel, and shelter. I believe in it for the reason that it puts almost every cent of every dollar of money expended by the Government into the hands of men who will at once put it into circulation.

In fact, my purpose in rising was to say that we should now take some of the P.W.A. money that has been allotted for public works, available on July 1 of this year, money which it is proposed to use for erecting buildings of doubtful necessity and utility, and definitely withdraw it, and recognizing the duty of Congress to share with the administration the responsibility of government, reallocate it to C.W.A. work, so that the millions who are living on C.W.A. funds at this time may continue to have employment, at least until the snow leaves the ground.

In Minnesota the situation is serious. We live in a northern climate. Winters are long. Our people have to burn coal often until the first of May; and the Federal Government must not, it cannot afford, to discontinue giving them and others in similar circumstances the opportunity to earn a living, to provide the necessities of life, between now and that time. I do not know the situation in the South. Spring comes earlier there, and the most urgent need will therefore end sooner; but I do know that in my section of the country, and I have been informed that in New England, in fact, in all the States of the North, a very serious condition will arise unless C.W.A. work is continued, and it is the duty of this Congress to provide the means whereby it may be continued. I deny that this is exclusively the responsibility of the President of the United States; it is our responsibility too, and unless adequate funds are reallocated within the next week I would suggest that the Committee on Appropriations should bring in a bill authorizing and directing such reallocation or providing other funds by which C.W.A. work may be continued.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. I yield.

Mr. BYRNS. Of course, the gentleman realizes that in the construction of public buildings and the prosecution of river and harbor works and these various activities that are going on, it is necessary to purchase material and this alone carries with it an unnamed number of men who are engaged in the fabrication of the material used. So the number of men employed cannot be confined simply to those who are actually upon the Government pay rolls.

No one has a higher respect for the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] than I, nor greater confidence in him; but I myself am not prepared to admit that his figures are entirely correct with reference to the amount of money needed to put one man to work on these various projects.

May I say also, if the gentleman will pardon me, with reference to his suggestion that the Appropriations Committee should get to work and allocate these funds, the gentleman knows very well that were such a practice followed it would entail not only unlimited delay with reference to the expenditure of the funds, but all over the country would go up the cry of pork-barrel methods. It would be difficult to keep that out of the picture if Congress undertook to allocate the funds in the manner suggested by the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SWICK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. I will say in answer to the distinguished majority leader that, in my opinion, if an outcry came against allocating P.W.A. funds to the C.W.A., it would

come from those throughout this country who are interested in pork, not from those whose interest is in giving workingmen employment. In fact, the very thing I proposed was to take some courthouses and post-office buildings out of the pork barrel and reallocate the money so that it may be used to relieve distress at this time, when such relief is sorely needed.

Answering the gentleman's question whether I know that in the erection of public buildings others besides those who lay one brick upon another get employment, I will say that I am very well aware of that fact. Of course, there must be factories to produce the raw material. Structural steel must be manufactured; stone must be cut and fabricated; portland cement must be made. But I have visited portland-cement factories and have found that the whole process of manufacturing cement is mechanical. A few men can turn out enough cement for construction involving the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars. I know that in the limestone quarries of Indiana most of the work is done by machines. I know that mechanization has been developed to the *n*th degree in the steel mills of Cleveland, Pittsburgh, and Gary. If it is our desire that the money we have appropriated shall be spent in such a way as to give the maximum relief to the workingmen whom we profess to wish to aid, I suggest that we see to it that the money is so used that as many cents as possible of every dollar shall go to buy bread, shelter, and fuel.

In that connection let me add that, insofar as it is advisable to spend money for public works to relieve unemployment, I believe it should be spent for roads rather than for public buildings, because, according to the statement of the distinguished minority member of the Appropriations Committee, in road work it does not cost more than \$2,400 a year to keep a man employed. I would also make the suggestion that if we are sincere in our profession that it is our purpose in appropriating money for public works to provide the necessities of life for workingmen and their families, we might consider taking some of the machinery off the road jobs and returning to the process of building roads by methods that will require more manual labor. I think the money we appropriate for unemployment relief should go not to the owners of machines but to men who will use it to support their families.

The great need of this country is not for more and finer post offices and courthouses. We are overbuilt now. We are erecting post offices at crossroad villages that represent an investment several times what any corporation would regard as a prudent investment for housing a business of equal volume. We do not need buildings, but we do need relief for unemployment. Municipalities and counties, and even States, have reached the end of their resources. They are not able to provide more funds, and the only place they can come is to the Federal Government. Personally, I oppose pork. I oppose the bootstrap-lifting process of enriching ourselves by spending money unnecessarily. But to relieve distress I would vote the last dollar out of the Treasury of the United States. I would vote to exhaust its credit if necessary to provide the means of livelihood for the American people, for that is our responsibility. We cannot shirk it. What we should have is less pork for politicians, more relief for the people.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. I want my colleague from Minnesota to understand that I am not against appropriating money for the C.W.A. work.

I believe that the C.W.A. is the one Federal appropriation that should be made immediately so that the millions of persons now engaged in C.W.A. projects can feel secure that their jobs will be safe. This work-relief project has been a boon to business in rural and urban Minnesota, and I am for it. I do say that the appropriations should be made, and I understand such appropriation has already been made for the completion of the post offices contemplated in the State of Minnesota. The post office at the city where the gentleman lives has already been finished. It cost nearly \$5,000,000. There is one in the city of St. Paul costing just about

that amount. I want to ask the gentleman if the people of my district and the people of the rest of the State of Minnesota should not have just about the same rights and privileges as you have in the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul?

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. I will say to my colleague that I was not a Member of Congress when the Minneapolis post office was authorized, nor have I ever advocated its erection, despite the fact that it is in my city. Frankly, I have questioned, as have many citizens of Minneapolis, whether it was a necessary expenditure of public money at a time when our resources should be used for relieving distress. In any pork which the gentleman may get in any forthcoming appropriation bill, let me say that I am not at all interested. I am surprised at his admission that he is interested, if that is the meaning he intended to convey.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAMSAY].

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to pay my meed of respect and appreciation for the vision and courage of the man of the hour that has instilled new hope and new confidence in the hearts of the people in these States.

In the first message the President of the United States gave to the American people after his election, he said he did not expect to make a home run every time he came to the bat. Since that time, he has taken many healthy swings at the ball, but no pitcher on the team of panic and oppression has been able to slip over even a strike.

I want to praise the wisdom and humanity that instigated the law which took 250,000 boys from the streets, from the pool rooms and dens of iniquity, and placed them on the broad highway of work and opportunity that will later pour them into the marts and trades of the United States, adding new impulse to the business ability and activity of the great American industries.

I also want to thank God for the vision that gave us the N.R.A.—the great keystone of the triumphant arch of the new deal that struck the shackles of industrial slavery from the children of America and turned their faces toward the little red schoolhouse on the hill, where they may learn the history and traditions of a great Nation.

It also revived from ruins and chaos the great industries of America that lay prostrate and helpless from their own folly. It has restored 6,000,000 men to labor and employment and given them a new hope and new confidence in the institutions of this Government. It has given to the laboring man for the first time in the history of any nation the right to bargain and deal for the sale of his only product—his labor.

Someone on the other side of the aisle has said "What about the cost of it all? How are we ever going to pay it back?" We will pay it back by the restoration of business; by the placing of every man in the United States in work and employment at a fair and living wage that will enable him to pay back to the Government a stream of taxes exacted by fair and just laws that will lift the deficit as rapidly as it was placed upon the people in America. And even though it takes years to repay it all back, is it not better to restore confidence in the Government of this country in the breast of the average citizen and restore to him the right to live and raise his family in an orderly and decent manner?

Mr. Chairman, the civilization of this country will not permit us to turn back. Civilization is progressive. Each generation has its rear rank and its front rank, but the march of progress goes steadily onward toward the evolution of God's final purpose. The rear rank of one generation takes its stand upon the ground that was once occupied by the front rank of a former generation, and front rank of the new generation takes its stand far beyond the ken of men of days gone by.

Time was—and not many generations ago—when ordinary men like you and I were considered as mere pawns to be used and cast aside by a man who lived across the seas, who wore a coronet on his brow and held a scepter in his hand. To him the life and welfare of the common man meant nothing. To the common man life held no bright future,

no bright promise to lure him on to noble thoughts and valorous achievements. But, thank God, the best spirit of the world has changed though the eternal battle of life still rages, though the strong continue to oppress the weak. Tears are shed and blood is spilled; yet above the din of strife, above the clash of arms—now strong, now weak, but ever growing more distinct—there comes a harmony of a sweet refrain. It is the world's front rank; it is that mighty advance guard of civilization as it pours forth that wondrous melody, that song of songs—"Equal Rights to All and Special Privileges to None." [Applause.]

Mr. SWICK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SHOEMAKER].

Mr. SHOEMAKER. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot said here today about the Navy and about bringing it up to the navies of some of the countries of the rest of the world and about spending a lot of money for weapons of destruction, but I have heard very little said here in favor of doing something that is really constructive.

Under this bill \$295,418,188 is proposed, and added to that is \$278,000,000 of so-called "Public Works funds", which make a total of \$573,418,188 to be spent for the purpose of destruction and not construction.

The Kaiser, for many, many years, propagated the idea that preparedness was the thing that was going to save Germany, and then we had a war to do away with militarism, and, after all was said and done, Germany won. We had a great war for democracy, and all we got out of it was prohibition, influenza, Herbert Hoover, and a depression [laughter], and we are still paying those war debts. This not only got us into this depression but it has put the entire world in a depression, and here we are going to squander money with the rest of the world to fix ourselves up to be in a position so we can have bigger and better and nobler and greater wars and create more catastrophes and cause more destruction; and we try at the same time to call ourselves civilized.

We argue about more men for the Navy, more man power for destruction. I want to say to you that up through the Northern States we have what is known as the "potato-soup line"—little children who are living upon potato soup—potatoes and water; and, thanks to the good Lord, the springs are still running or they might not have the soup—these little potbellies, with sprawly, scrawly limbs and trembling knees—and down through the South we have the scurvy brigade. Our little children are suffering from malnutrition and want of food. There are over 2,000,000 of these little waifs, according to the Department of Labor, who are now out of school, with no shoes and no clothing, with teachers by the thousands being laid off. Many of these teachers are walking the streets unemployed after putting in a lifetime and a small fortune, and, in many instances, a large fortune, into an education so that they might teach our boys and girls of this great land.

Not only this, there are hundreds of millions of dollars in salaries owing at the present time to school teachers, and so religiously and so generously do they give of their time that they go on teaching these little children.

Oh, we talk about men for the Navy. Are you going to make sailors and soldiers out of the potato-soup line of the North or the scurvy line of the South? I want to say to you that this big Navy program is for the purpose of following the American dollar and for the purpose of backing up national imperialism abroad. This is what this is for. It is about time for this Congress to come back to the plans and principles of George Washington, who advised against foreign entanglements and advised us to stay home and take care of our own business.

O Mr. Chairman, how long are we going to allow this suffering to continue? We are appropriating \$573,418,188 so that we can go through one more holocaust of hell such as we went through in the late World War, and do it over again.

William Randolph Hearst goes out here and hires people to take pictures of some Japs taking a picture of some old horse out here on a road in New Jersey and plays it up in

big headlines to fan the flames and try to get our jingoes to go wild here on the floor of Congress. We are going to protect the Philippines, the Hawaiian Islands, and various other possessions in foreign countries, but I believe it is our first duty to protect the children of America, and once again open the door of opportunity which has been closed to them by organized greed, graft, and concentrated wealth in America.

I believe the time has come when if J. Pierpont Morgan wants an army, we should let him recruit his own army and go ahead. The last time we had a war he sent Gen. Hugh S. Johnson over here to run the American World War by having him write up the Draft Act for General Crowder, so we could draft the young manhood of the country into the United States Army to fight for J. Pierpont Morgan. This is the same General Johnson who is drafting the N.R.A. code to protect the House of Morgan and the grafters and the gluttons of gold in this country of ours. Is it not about time that the American people woke up to what is going on and what is being done to them?

Oh, in our State the people are beginning to realize that the only difference between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party is that one of them is a carbunkle and the other is a boil, and both of them are the tools of big business—the gold-dust twins of Wall Street. This is why they send a few of us Farmer-Laborites down here.

Today, in the interest of big business, we are going to rob the suffering children of America and deny them future education; rob our patient, energetic, and religiously sincere school teachers, who follow their profession with such zest that they are compelled to forfeit their future wages so we can build up a navy—build up an instrument of destruction to protect the gods of gold and the gods of mammon.

I want to say to you that if we proceed in the manner in which we are going it will not be long when these two old political parties of the United States, who represent property rights, will be sunk into oblivion, and the great American people will step forward into a political party that represents the human rights of mankind, and we will once more return to the kind of government that we were originally intended to be when we divorced ourselves from the Crown of England and established a government by and for the people, which has now been stolen. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SWICK. Mr. Chairman, I am today introducing in the House the American Legion's clarified 4-point bill as substitute for H.R. 6215, which I introduced on January 3, 1934, at the request of Otto F. Messner, commander of the Pennsylvania State department of the American Legion and the vice chairman of the American Legion national legislative committee.

The fact that the President signed four Executive orders yesterday which it is said will restore approximately \$21,092,205 annually to veterans and their dependents, is in my opinion an admission on the part of the administration that it acted hastily and unmercifully when it determined on the drastic cuts provided in the Economy Act and subsequent regulations issued by the President.

It now admits that veterans suffering from nonservice diseases requiring emergency or extended care, who are unable to pay for such treatment, should be hospitalized in veterans' hospitals where facilities are available. If that is so now, and I think it is, I cannot understand what conditions have been unearthed since the enactment of the Economy Act that were not known before that would prompt this change in the opinions of the Director of the Budget and others responsible for the order. Can they by Executive order bring back those men who have died because of their previous action through lack of medical treatment, or allay the sufferings of those denied such treatment during the past 9 months?

The President by his orders increases from \$90 to \$100 per month the pensions to veterans suffering from total permanent service-connected disability, with proportionate increases for lesser disabilities. I cannot help wondering what conditions have changed during the past 9 months that

would justify this change of heart. Certainly it cannot be an increased cost of living, which the President denies in his statement denying pay increases.

The Executive order issued yesterday also indicates a change of heart toward veterans of the Spanish-American War, no longer requiring proof of service connection. What information has been received since the enactment of the Economy Act that would cause this order?

Can it be possible that the administration leaders recognize the justness of the Legion's 4-point bill and believe the Members of Congress will insist upon its enactment? Is this change of heart simply designed to defeat favorable consideration of the Legion's program, which proposes to restore eligibility for service-connected disabilities, with actual monetary payments that existed prior to March 20, 1933, with the exception of veterans enlisting after the armistice, where the Government can prove disability occurred before or after service or where service connection had been established by fraud, error, or misrepresentation? The bill would restore hospitalization privileges in the same manner approved by the President yesterday. It would further provide pensions for widows and orphans in need on the same rates and conditions provided for the Spanish-American War under the Economy Act.

I have served on the World War Veterans' Legislative Committee and the Pensions Committee since coming to Congress and have been confronted with the legislative programs of the American Legion and other organizations at various times. I have not always been able to accept them in their entirety, but I believe the 4-point program provided in this bill is the best and most conservative legislation ever proposed by a veterans' organization; it does not repeal the Economy Act nor restore non-service-connected disability compensation. It has the authority of years of experience in veterans' problems behind it and is deserving of the favorable consideration of this Congress. It will restore benefits to those who are justly entitled to them, with the assurance that they will not be disturbed by the whims of individuals not informed on the subject.

It is estimated that the maximum cost of this bill would be \$80,000,000 a year, and in the opinion of the Legion it will not cost more than \$65,000,000 a year, or about the cost of the C.W.A. program for 1 week. As one who supported the President's economy bill, believing that veterans would be dealt with with justice and mercy, I think the enactment of this bill is the only way we can rectify the unjustified reductions made in veterans' benefits by the powers granted the President at that time.

The vice chairman of the national legislative committee of the American Legion, Col. John Thomas Taylor, informed me today that the recent Executive orders were not satisfactory and would not cause a lessening in the Legion's demand for enactment of this bill.

I yield, Mr. Chairman, 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I desire at this time to pay my respects and compliments to the distinguished occupant of the White House, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, also to his far-sighted and competent Secretary of the Navy, Hon. Claude A. Swanson. In their determination to restore to this country an adequate Navy, they are carrying out the policy of one of the greatest Americans in history, Theodore Roosevelt, who, as Assistant Secretary of the Navy and as President of the United States and as a citizen and patriot, never wavered in his demand for preparedness and the necessity for a Naval Establishment of the first magnitude.

In 1903, President Theodore Roosevelt dedicated the Naval Memorial Monument in Union Square in San Francisco. His words of dedication still linger in the minds and memory of those of us who were present on that occasion:

It is eminently fitting—

Said he then—

that there should be here in this great city on the Pacific Ocean a monument to commemorate the deed which showed once for all that America had taken her position in the Pacific. * * * To dedicate the monument would be an empty and foolish thing if

we accompanied it by an abandonment of our national policy of building up the Navy. * * * Applaud the Navy and what it has done. That is first-class. But make your applause count by seeing to it that the Navy is so built up that the men of the next generation will have something to applaud also.

The Nation must have physical no less than moral courage; the capacity to do and dare and die at need and that grim and steadfast resolution which alone will carry a great people through a great peril. * * * Diplomacy is utterly useless when there is no force behind it; * * * an ignoble peace is even worse than an unsuccessful war. We ask for an armament fit for the Nation's needs, not primarily to fight, but to avoid fighting. Peace, like freedom, is not a gift that tarries long in the hands of cowards or of those too feeble or too short-sighted to deserve it, and we ask to be given the means to insure that honorable peace which alone is worth having. * * *

There is no more utterly useless and even utterly mischievous citizen, than the peace-at-any-price, universal-arbitration type of being, who is always complaining, either about war or else about the cost of armaments which act as the insurance against war. In the present stage of civilization a proper armament is the surest guarantee of peace and is the only guarantee that war, if it does come, will not mean irreparable and overwhelming disaster. The huckster or pawnbroker type is usually physically timid and likes to cover an unworthy fear of the most just war under high-sounding names. The large mollusc vote * * * consists of the people who are soft physically and morally or who have a twist in them which makes them cantankerous and unpleasant as long as they can be so with safety to their bodies. In addition there are the good people with no imagination and no foresight who think war will not come, but that if it does come, armies and navies can be improvised. I abhor unjust war; I believe that war should never be resorted to when or so long as it is honorably possible to avoid it. I advocate preparation for war in order to avert war, and I should never advocate war unless it were the only alternative to dishonor. * * * There is no surer way of courting national disaster than to be opulent, aggressive, and unarmed.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, why, may I ask, in this time of unemployment and depression, is there wisdom in constructing unneeded public buildings and folly in building an adequate Navy? [Applause.]

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HENNEY].

Mr. HENNEY. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I was particularly interested in the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] this morning in which he, while discussing the appropriations to the Naval Department, stated, in substance, that outside of the four hundred millions used in civil-works projects and allocated out of the three billion four hundred million public-works appropriation a too small proportion of the balance actually went to direct labor. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that, barring the element of graft, or, to use an everyday colloquialism, chiseling, precisely the same percentage of expended funds go to labor in the erecting of public buildings and bridges and constructing battle cruisers as would be possible in the regular C.W.A., C.C.C., or other recognized hand-labor programs, allowing, of course, for the higher wage differential for skilled labor, such as masons, steelworkers, architects, engineers, and so forth, whose services are technical and whose positions cannot be filled by the ordinary pick-and-shovel laborer. The building of, say one of the large governmental buildings in Washington, returns to labor by far the larger portion of the money expended. Leaving out the actual cost of the raw materials in their crude state and deducting the profits to contractors, which, Mr. Chairman, I deplore as having been far and away too lucrative in the past, and which I hope and verily believe in the future under the wise guidance of our great President will be reduced to a minimum—every cent of the balance goes to labor. Take, for instance, a modern road-building project, in which formerly possibly three or four hundred laborers per mile were employed. Today a contractor will move in with a steam shovel, operated by one or two men, and 8 or 10 caterpillar dump trucks and do twice as much work in grading and surfacing a road as the whole three or four hundred hand laborers.

But, Mr. Chairman, it takes hundreds of workers to build these steam shovels, tractors, cement mixers, and so forth. It requires hundreds of men in the mines and in the smelters to produce the steel. Men are employed on the railroads to transport the machines and the cement. Then, again, men are employed in the forests to supply lumber for

the freight cars, railroad ties, and so forth. It calls for men to supply gasoline and transport it; men to build power dams or mine coal to produce electricity used in welding and for power to construct machinery; men to mine and kiln the cement and to dig and transport gravel; and because these men are not out on that particular stretch of road building we are told that there is little direct labor employed; and yet were it not for road building, public and private building, thousands and thousands of men in lumber camps, in mines, on railroads, in machine shops, and in power plants would be thrown out of employment.

And again I submit, Mr. Chairman, that outside of the cost of crude materials such as iron, granite, gravel, and so forth, in its raw state, every penny ultimately goes back to labor and is put into circulation, increasing the purchasing power of the masses whether in one form of public works or another. In the last analysis the money that is being expended is going to the people who need it and who will spend it at the bottom of the economic pyramid and where it will revive the small business man, the country banker, and the professional men and artisans of every hamlet, village, and city in our land. This is not a program of redistribution of wealth, but it is a revaluation of human opportunities and in keeping with our great President's expressed desire that men and women must be paid decent and livable wages. In this connection I have felt that the cost-of-living index during the past 6 months has increased much more than the Department of Labor's figures have shown. This I have adduced from the increased cost of commodities that we purchase in our own homes. Personally I believe they are increased well above 25 percent, and, therefore, I have been particularly interested in the rural carriers of the Postal Department and the postal railway-mail clerks. These men have not only had the regular 15-percent economy cuts but with their furloughs of 2 weeks every 3 months they have had an additional 16 $\frac{2}{3}$ -percent cut. Then in the case of the rural carriers, their maintenance for equipment was cut from 4 cents per mile to 1 cent per mile, 2 cents of which was later remitted to them, making a total of 3 cents per mile or, on the basis of a 30-mile route, 90 cents per day. In starting and stopping their automobiles every few hundred yards, letting their engines idle while making deliveries, and traveling much of the time in first and second gear, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this will little more than pay for gas and oil or, figuring on another basis, 90 cents per day for 300 days per year amounts to \$270 per year, which is to pay for gasoline, oil, tires, chains, repairs, license fee, insurance, and exchange depreciation on their cars each year, to say nothing of livery hire that those carriers who live in snow-bound States are obliged to pay for 3 or 4 months out of each year.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I received from Mr. G. F. Bartelt, president of the Wisconsin Rural Letter Carriers' Association, together with a survey made by his association of the status of rural carriers' expenses in the great State of Wisconsin, which I have the honor of representing as one of its Representatives in the Seventy-third Congress. These statistics and conclusions are startling in what they show and are conclusive proof that this branch of the service, to use modern slang, is "getting the worst of it." I hope our Postmaster General, who, I am glad to say, is giving one of the best administrations of that Department in many years, will see fit to rectify some of the inequities that now exist. Certainly, there will not be much gained by way of rigid economy in this Department, which costs the Government approximately \$30,000,000 per year as against the extravagant, wasteful, and high-binding subsidies that go to the holders of air mail and ocean mail contracts, in which the subsidies alone are equal to the entire cost of the rural-delivery system. The hearings that are now taking place before the Senate committee show conclusively one of the reasons for the huge deficit that has existed in the Post Office Department in the past; and I, for one, believe that the small saving that can be brought about by pinching the rural carriers,

as well as the city carriers, postal railway clerks, and so forth, is infinitesimal when compared to other departmental leaks that have existed in the past. It is the old adage of saving at the spigot and wasting at the bunghole, and I truly believe that when Postmaster General Farley has completed his program of repair, that all these leaks will be stopped and the lowly carrier will come into his own.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

I append the following letters:

WISCONSIN RURAL LETTER CARRIERS ASSOCIATION,
Marathon, Wis., January 15, 1934.

HON. CHARLES W. HENNEY,
Member of Congress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HENNEY: It is with a great deal of disappointment that I read of the recent Presidential order continuing the 15-percent reduction in salaries of Government employees for another 6 months.

Let me say that the rural carriers have taken the reduction in salary without complaint; we have taken it in a true American spirit, ready to do our bit in assisting to wipe out the deficit in the Post Office Department; however, we were allowed to hope that such reduction would be but of short duration, we have looked forward to January 1934 hoping that at this time at least a partial restoration in salary would be made. We fear to face the next 6 months with this continued reduction, for we have learned by sad experience that it is impossible to maintain a balanced budget with the present salary.

I believe that of all Government employees the rural carriers are in the worst predicament, although it may seem that the total salary paid is sufficient, the amount is far from being net to the carrier, after paying the expense necessary to render service, there is but a very meager amount left from which it is impossible to maintain our household, at least not according to the American standard of living.

I am enclosing herewith a summary of a survey recently taken among a number of rural carriers in Wisconsin, from all sections of the State. This will give to you a true picture of the average rural carrier and his condition of labor. I sincerely hope that these figures will be of interest to you and worthy of your careful consideration.

Let me respectfully call your attention to a few of the items. You will note that many of the roads over which rural carriers travel are still unsurfaced; in fact, many miles of road are little more than cow paths, the majority, of course, are graveled, and but very few miles hard-surfaced; you will note also that the average rural carrier works well over 7 hours per day, which is considerably more than the few hours we are usually given credit for; notice also the amount of expense in maintaining our equipment and the sum necessary for equipment; please note also the financial standing of the average rural carrier; in fact, after studying this report you will have a true picture of the average rural carrier in Wisconsin and the problems confronting him.

I am also enclosing herewith accurate expense accounts of a number of carriers for the months of November and December. Of course this amount cannot be taken as a monthly average as at this time of year the expense is slightly over average; however, it is the actual amount spent during these months in order to render service.

Being aware of your fair-mindedness and ever-predominant desire to see that justice prevails, we respectfully solicit your support in the interest of the rural service and the rural carrier, to the end that we may get a square deal, and that the net salary to the rural carriers be at least on the level with that of city carriers and post-office clerks.

Again hoping that this information will be of value and interest to you, and sincerely hoping that Congress will see fit to restore at least a part of the reduction in salary retroactive to January 1934.

Thanking you in advance for your assistance, I am,
Very respectfully yours,

G. F. BARTELT,
President Wisconsin Rural Letter Carriers Association,
Marathon, Wis.

Summary of survey among Wisconsin rural-mail carriers

| | Total number of replies | Grand total | Average |
|--|-------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| 1. Total length of route..... | 463 | 15,113.07 | 32.64 miles. |
| 2. Various types of roads: | | | |
| Hard surface..... | 463 | 1,844.62 | 3.98 miles. |
| Gravel..... | 463 | 7,907.32 | 17.07 miles. |
| Dirt..... | 463 | 5,361.13 | 11.53 miles. |
| 3. Number of boxes served..... | 463 | 68,156 | 147.20 boxes. |
| 4. Hours used for office work each day..... | 462 | 865.30 | 1.87 hours. |
| 5. Time used in care of equipment each day..... | 462 | 552.70 | 1.19 hours. |
| 6. Time used to serve route during most difficult road conditions..... | 462 | 3,641 | 7.88 hours. |
| 7. Length of time these periods cover each year..... | 462 | 1,494 | 3.23 months. |
| 8. Time used to serve route during ideal conditions..... | 462 | 1,492.65 | 3.01 hours. |

Summary of survey among Wisconsin rural-mail carriers—Con.

| | Total number of replies | Grand total | Average |
|--|-------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| 9. Length of time ideal periods cover each year. | 462 | 4,038 | 8.74 months. |
| 10. Money spent for auxiliary help each year. | 463 | \$5,344.08 | \$11.54. |
| 11. Number hiring auxiliary help. | 463 | 283 | 0.50 percent. |
| 12. Number of members in family. | 463 | 1,907 | 4.09. |
| 13. How many under 21 years. | 463 | 806 | 1.93. |
| 14. Other dependents supported wholly or in part. | 463 | 433 | 0.93. |
| 15. Number supporting other dependents. | 463 | 196 | 0.42 percent. |
| 16. Do you own property? | 463 | 376 | 81 percent. |
| 17. What is the value? | 376 | \$1,357,265 | \$3,603.54. |
| 18. Part acquired from earnings as rural carrier. | 376 | \$381,402 | \$1,014.10. |
| 19. Part acquired through inheritance. | 376 | \$191,520 | \$509.36. |
| 20. Indebtedness due to mortgage on property. | 376 | \$357,825 | \$951.64. |
| 21. Other indebtedness. | 463 | \$155,062 | \$334.69. |
| 22. What is the original cost of equipment you own? | 463 | \$456,992 | \$987.01. |
| 23. Cost of equipment necessary to carry mail on route under present conditions. | 463 | \$440,124 | \$950.59. |
| 24. Premium paid annually for health, accident, and life insurance. | 463 | \$62,170.55 | \$134.27. |
| 25. Amount spent each year for— | | | |
| Taxes. | 376 | \$27,077.48 | \$71.99. |
| Fire insurance. | 463 | \$8,184.63 | \$17.67. |
| Auto insurance. | 463 | \$11,906.12 | \$25.69. |
| 26. Money received from investments or labor other than for services as rural carrier. | 463 | \$17,753.46 | \$38.10. |
| 27. Number receiving money from other sources. | 463 | 112 | 24 percent. |
| 28. Pay docked for noncompletion of service on route during past several years. | 463 | \$407.98 | \$0.88. |
| 29. Number having been docked for non-service. | 463 | 46 | 9 percent. |
| 30. Amount spent each year for— | | | |
| Gas. | 462 | \$94,620 | \$204.80. |
| Oil. | 462 | \$12,591 | \$27.25. |
| Tires. | 460 | \$18,027 | \$39.14. |
| Repairs. | 460 | \$34,838 | \$75.51. |
| 31. Amount spent each year for horse-drawn equipment. | 463 | \$34,440 | \$74.38. |
| 32. Number needing horse-drawn equipment. | 463 | 282 | 60 percent. |
| 33. Average depreciation on equipment. | 461 | \$110,390 | \$234.45. |
| 34. Equipment necessary to handle route: | | | |
| Automobiles. | 463 | \$522 | \$1.12. |
| Snowmobiles. | 463 | \$139 | \$0.30. |
| Wagons. | 463 | \$278 | \$0.66. |
| Sleighs. | 463 | \$301 | \$0.64. |
| Horses. | 463 | \$487 | \$1.05. |
| 35. Pieces of mail handled on route monthly: | | | |
| First-class. | 399 | 1,307,492 | 3,276 pieces. |
| Second-class. | 399 | 1,566,976 | 3,926 pieces. |
| Third-class. | 399 | 1,065,024 | 2,744 pieces. |
| Fourth-class. | 399 | 159,747 | 400 pieces. |
| 36. Average stamp sale on route monthly. | 433 | \$11,912 | \$27.51. |
| 37. Applications for money orders on route monthly. | 431 | 29,235 | 67.83 orders. |
| 38. Insured parcels handled on route monthly. | 440 | 8,062 | 18 pieces. |
| 39. Pieces of registered mail handled on route monthly. | 439 | 3,346 | 7 pieces. |
| 40. What is your age? | 462 | 19,921 | 43.11 years. |
| 41. How many years have you carried mail? | 462 | 7,838 | 16.98 years. |
| 42. Were you appointed as result of examination? | 462 | 444 | 96 percent. |
| 43. Or were you transferred from some other service? | 462 | 18 | 3 percent. |
| 44. Are you an ex-service man? | 462 | 186 | 40 percent. |

REMARKS.—All figures shown in average column of summary sheet are plus further fractions. Taking the average time during both ideal and difficult conditions, plus office time and time spent in care of equipment, the average rural carrier works a total of 7.37 hours per day.

Salary (average length of route, 32.46 miles)

| | |
|---|------------|
| Annual salary, 33-mile route | \$2,070.00 |
| Less 3 1/2 percent deduction for retirement fund (\$72.45) | 1,997.55 |
| Plus equipment allowance at 4 cents per mile (\$403.92) | 2,401.47 |
| Less average expense and depreciation on equipment, not figuring interest on investment | 655.53 |

Net salary to carrier..... 1,745.94

Since the reduction in Government employees' salary the rural carrier has worked for:

| | |
|---|--------|
| Less 3 cents per mile equipment allowance | 302.94 |
| Less 15-percent reduction in salary | 310.50 |

Net salary to carrier since reduction..... 1,132.50

Nov. 1, 1933, 2 cents per mile equipment allowance restored..... 201.96

Net salary to carrier since Nov. 1..... 1,334.46

Average rural carrier handles 10,346 pieces of mail per month.

Result of the November questionnaire of a number of rural carriers in Wisconsin

| | Number of replies | Grand total | Average |
|--|-------------------|-------------|---------|
| Total number of miles traveled per day | 460 | 14,846.95 | 32.27 |
| Total amount spent for gas | 460 | \$7,873.94 | \$17.11 |
| Total amount spent for oil | 460 | 1,280.91 | 2.81 |
| Total amount spent for tires | 460 | 2,514.37 | 5.46 |
| Total amount spent for repairs | 460 | 5,559.67 | 12.08 |
| Amount for other expenses, such as rented warm garage, antifreeze solution, etc. | 460 | 2,207.89 | 4.80 |
| Total amount spent for motor delivery | 460 | 19,445.78 | 42.27 |
| Amount spent for 170 carriers for horse-drawn equipment: | | | |
| Total mileage | 170 | 5,162.44 | 30.37 |
| Amount spent for feed | 170 | \$2,028.02 | \$11.90 |
| Amount spent for repairs on equipment | 170 | 383.73 | 2.25 |
| Total amount spent for horse-drawn equipment | 170 | 2,411.75 | 14.12 |
| Total amount spent, both kinds of equipment | 460 | 21,857.53 | 47.51 |

This survey taken among 460 rural carriers from all sections of the State of Wisconsin shows what the average carrier, serving a 32.27-mile route, actually spent during the month of November to render service on said route, or an average of \$47.51. This figure does not include depreciation on equipment or new equipment; it represents the actual cash spent for maintenance.

Taking the salary for a 32-mile route, or \$2,040 annually, less 3 1/2-percent deduction for retirement fund, and less the 15-percent reduction in Government employees' salary, leaves the carrier a monthly salary of..... \$138.55
Add equipment allowance, at 3 cents per mile, 25 days..... 24.00

Total salary to carrier..... 162.55

Less the \$47.51 spent for maintenance and the average monthly depreciation on equipment, as shown by survey of 462 carriers in Wisconsin (\$234.45 annually), or \$19.53 per month, total expense..... 67.04

Net salary to carrier..... 95.51

Questionnaires on file in my office and can be attested to before notary public if necessary.

G. F. BARTELT,
President Wisconsin Rural Carriers Association,
Marathon, Wis.

Results of the December expense-account survey of a number of rural carriers in Wisconsin

| | Number of carriers | Grand total | Average |
|---|--------------------|-------------|---------|
| Total number of miles traveled per day | 285 | 9,148.89 | 32.10 |
| Amount spent for gas | 285 | \$5,356.30 | \$18.76 |
| Amount spent for oil | 285 | 832.03 | 2.90 |
| Amount spent for tires | 285 | 1,021.53 | 3.58 |
| Amount spent for repairs | 285 | 2,949.09 | 10.31 |
| Amount for other expense, such as rented heated garage, chains, antifreeze solution, etc. | 285 | 979.36 | 3.39 |
| Total amount spent for motor delivery | 285 | 11,138.31 | 39.08 |
| Amount spent by 102 carriers for horse-drawn equipment | 102 | 1,732.33 | 16.98 |
| Amount spent by 22 carriers for hiring auxiliary help | 22 | 143.60 | 6.52 |
| Total amount spent for both kinds of equipment and auxiliary help—grand total expense | 285 | 13,014.24 | 45.66 |

This report shows the amount spent by 285 carriers during the month of December 1933 in maintaining necessary equipment in order to properly render service on their routes, or an average of \$45.66; this figure does not include depreciation on equipment, new equipment, or interest on investment. Reports on file in my office, and their accuracy can be attested to before a notary public.

G. F. BARTELT,
President Wisconsin Rural Letter Carriers Association,
Marathon, Wis.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LANHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H.R. 7199, the naval appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2284. An act relating to contracts and agreements under the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

CONTRACTS UNDER AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table S. 2284, relating to contracts and agreements under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, a similar House bill having been favorably reported from the committee, now on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman should make a short statement of what this is.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, some years ago a law was enacted forbidding Members of Congress to enter into any kind of contract with the Government, declaring such contracts void, and fixing a penalty. Under the Agricultural Adjustment Act all those who are producing certain basic commodities are permitted to enter into reduction contracts. Under the terms of this old law the Members of Congress who happen to be interested in farming are unable to go along with the program. This permits them, notwithstanding those provisions, to sign these contracts like any other citizen.

Mr. SNELL. And that is all there is to this?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. It does not cover anybody else?

Mr. JONES. No; the original ban was simply on Members of Congress.

Mr. SNELL. And that applies to this individual subject concerning contracts to reduce acreage?

Mr. JONES. Yes; or to reduction of production.

Mr. SNELL. And it is agreeable to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of section 3741 of the Revised Statutes (U.S.C., title 41, sec. 22) and sections 114 and 115 of the Criminal Code of the United States (U.S.C., title 18, secs. 204 and 205) shall not apply to any contracts or agreements heretofore or hereafter entered into under the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill was ordered to lie on the table.

C.W.A. MUST CONTINUE "FOR THE DURATION"

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short editorial from a Philadelphia paper this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial favoring continuation of C.W.A.:

[From the Philadelphia Record of Jan. 21, 1934]

Don't beat a retreat with the battle half won. Announcement of shortened hours, reduced pay, gradual abandonment of C.W.A. entirely after February 15 is an about face on the most immediately successful offensive of the administration against the depression.

Liberals in Washington must fight for reestablishment of this definite national policy.

C.W.A. must be expanded, not curtailed.

C.W.A. must be continued for the duration of the depression.

When President Roosevelt announced the C.W.A. campaign on November 15, he declared:

"I am very confident that the mere fact of giving real wages to 4,000,000 Americans who today are not getting wages is going

to do more to relieve suffering and to lift the morale of the Nation than anything undertaken before."

The President was right. The American Federation of Labor reports that C.W.A. has absorbed 40 percent of the Nation's unemployed. It has provided more new purchasing power than has the entire increase in private business activity.

Are we to call off our forces just when the enemy line is beginning to waver?

When the President talked about "relieving suffering" did he mean until February 15 only? Is there any difference between suffering after February 15 and suffering before February 15?

Isn't it just as important to "lift the morale of the Nation" after February 15 as before?

The President said C.W.A. would transform millions of Americans into "wage-earning, independent workers, no longer dependent on charity."

How long is "no longer"?

Federal Relief Administrator Hopkins declares no new men are to be hired for C.W.A. jobs; that 1,000,000 are to be dropped every 2 weeks after February 15.

But C.W.A. didn't really get started until near the end of December. Only \$400,000,000 was allotted to it, all told. Only \$216,000,000 has been spent.

It has produced more results, in stimulated consumption and human relief, per dollar invested than any other Federal effort.

Indeed, in view of the tardiness of P.W.A., the logical move for the administration would be to transfer funds from P.W.A. to C.W.A.

The President wants the Nation to spend its way out of depression. C.W.A. and direct relief are the only Federal efforts that have actually succeeded in distributing new purchasing power. P.W.A. has actually spent less than \$250,000,000 of its \$3,300,000,000, exclusive of its C.W.A. expenditure.

To abandon C.W.A. is to call off our strongest regiment.

Unless the President agrees to have C.W.A. continue for the duration of the depression, the depression will continue far beyond 1935, the year he has set as its end.

OLD-AGE PENSION

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, on last Wednesday evening one of my colleagues from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN] spoke over a network of 16 stations, originating in the studios of WOL in Washington, extending from New York to San Antonio, Tex. The subject of this most able address is "Federal compensation for old age". The speaker was introduced by Dr. J. E. Pope, president of the National Old Age Pension Association. I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by including the introductory remarks of Dr. Pope and the address of my colleague.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Dr. POPE. In fighting for a principle it gives one courage to contact a man who is a veteran warrior for our cause. We of Oklahoma are proud of our entire State delegation. Especially are we proud of that stalwart, outstanding Member of the National Congress from Ada. Ladies and gentlemen, it becomes my privilege and high honor to present to you one of God's noble men, that sturdy and courageous Member of the Congress from the Fourth Oklahoma District, the Honorable Tom D. McKEOWN.

Mr. McKEOWN. Thank you, Dr. Pope. Permit me to say that your unselfish devotion to this great cause has endeared you to the hearts of official Washington and to the Nation. Even those who differ with you in opinion are, nevertheless, forced to admire your courage and sincerity.

Ladies and gentlemen, a couple of decades ago if one had suggested old-age security in the United States he would have been immediately branded as the reddest of radicals, but today many of the leading men and women in public life are openly advocating legislation for old-age security. Among the latter is Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, who recently, before a great audience in the auditorium of the United States Chamber of Commerce, speaking on this subject, said that "it is the right of old people who have worked all of their lives and have failed through no fault of their own to make provision, to be cared for in the last few years of their lives. We did it at first in what I believe a terrible way—the poorhouse."

In the early beginning of our colonial life of America there was a great scarcity of labor, and good wages were paid compared to wages paid for similar work in the old countries. Immigration companies in England advertised high American wages. There was such a scarcity of labor throughout the colonial period that it influenced customs and legislation and was the cause of the establishment of securing workers by contract. During this period every effort was made to control labor by legislative action in

order to prevent skilled labor from entering the industry of agriculture due to "the abundance of land and the efforts of companies to plant settlers upon it." In the Colony of Virginia the tendency of skilled labor to become farmers was frowned upon and legislated against, declaring that "it was more to the public welfare and the glory of God to hold them to their trade." It is a long trek from those days when labor was scarce to this period when there is no employment for labor and millions of our people are out of employment. These conditions have been brought about, as all of us realize, by great economical changes due to several causes. The most brutal practice ever inaugurated in industry was inaugurated in the United States—the rule put into effect by several industries that no new employee would be employed that was over the age of 45 years. In other words, 45 years of age was fixed as the dead line over which a worker could not pass in the event he lost his position. It is as a chain that binds him to his doom. It is a gruesome, fatal rule inaugurated by greed and maintained by selfishness. It should be abolished and forever banned from American industry. This rule has added tremendously to the necessity for old-age security.

There is another great group of people in the United States who are now aged and helpless due to the circumstances over which they have no control. After having spent a long life of thrift and saving they placed all their savings in securities that have proven worthless or in banks that have failed. There may be no children upon whom they can depend, and find themselves in extreme want, depending entirely upon the charity of their neighbors. There are some who have been thoughtless and extravagant in the days when they could work and earn their livings, but have lived the lives of honest, respectable citizens. Old-age security should not be limited in its operation to care for the aged, but should also embrace those who are disabled by disease and accident and the unfortunate blind in need.

We have passed humane laws known as "Workmen Compensation Acts", for the benefit of employees who are injured during their employment. Civil damages have always been recoverable by employees for injuries where injuries were due directly to the negligence of the employer, but thousands of employees who were guilty of contributory negligence or the negligence of fellow servants were denied relief.

Many citizens will inquire, Why bring up the question of old-age security at this time when the revenue is at such low ebb and the Treasury so near empty? The answer is the 4 years of severe depression in all lines of business has placed an unbearable burden upon the community where those unfortunate people reside. I would not add to the unfortunate burden of the hard-pressed taxpayer, but it is not fair for the generous-hearted neighborhood friends and citizens to bear this burden all the years; the selfish should be made to contribute their part to this common burden of the American people. There are a number of ways sufficient money can be found to carry this burden without adding additional weight to the hard-pressed taxpayer.

One day in April 1928 I returned to my hotel and found my wife very much upset about an experience she had just passed through. She told me that while on the streets of Washington her attention was attracted by the action of an old couple. The man was looking into a garbage receptacle, and he said to the woman, "I do not find anything." My wife turned immediately and inquired if they had lost something, and then she learned that they were an old, aged couple from a nearby State who had lost their home by foreclosure and having no place to go had come to Washington to find a nephew who lived in the Capital City and, being unable to find him, were without funds or food. He was hunting in the can for something to eat. She administered to their immediate needs and secured a temporary place for them. After she told her story I promised I would do my best to prevent this sort of thing and to lend my energy to the cause of bringing a ray of hope and happiness to the aged and helpless in my country.

As early as May 8, 1928, I introduced in Congress a bill authorizing an appropriation for cooperating with the States granting old-aged and disabled persons pensions, and for other purposes. The committee to which this bill was sent refused to even grant a hearing. That was in the Seventieth Congress, and I followed this again by a bill in the Seventy-first Congress, and it had a similar fate. Again in the first session of the Seventy-second Congress I introduced another bill. In the meantime sentiment for this character of legislation had tremendously grown throughout the United States by the enactment in many States of old-age security legislation.

It has been my contention that it would cost the people of this country very much less to provide and care for the aged, the disabled, and the needy blind through a system where monthly checks could be sent to them than under the present eleemosynary system whereby there is maintained miscellaneous homes for the aged persons. There are at least 10,037 such private homes caring for 68,659 persons at a total cost of \$26,306,477; in addition, there are 2,183 poorhouses in the United States housing 85,889 persons at an additional cost of \$28,740,535, or an average of \$334.64 a person, and with a total investment exceeding \$150,000,000.

The old-age security bill that I sponsored did not interfere in any way with the various organized private homes. An old-age security law properly administered would not encourage the people to abandon thrifty habits, but would assure them contentment and longer lives. It is incomprehensible to me that very many of our people would abandon their efforts to make a liveli-

hood and deliberately place themselves in a helpless financial condition. Old-age security legislation will encourage the self-respect of the citizens because provision is made that whenever one is able to work and can find employment he must earn as much of his living as he can with the assurance that if his earnings fall below \$365 per annum that he is guaranteed at least that much to live on.

A system for old-age security should not only provide for the immediate care of the aged, the helpless, and the needy blind, but should make provisions so that oncoming generations can make provision by contribution from their income to their old-age security. In other words, I would provide for contributions from all persons under a fixed age; or, in other words, extend them an opportunity to contribute to the security of their old age and require their employer, where they are wage earners, to contribute something to this fund and the Government administer the distribution of the same.

Whenever the citizen arrives at the age of 65 years and his circumstances are such as not to require old-age assistance he would be permitted to withdraw in a lump sum his savings with the accumulated interest.

If the aged and helpless people are permitted to receive a monthly check they can then go out and bargain for their immediate necessities and this in itself maintains self-respect and eliminates the harrowing worries that shorten their days on this earth.

The need is great and the urge is strong for this legislation and I hope our wishes shall be materialized in the near future.

If any of my Oklahoma friends are listening in I wish to say I am working hard and feeling fine—I'll do my best.

I wish to express my thanks to Dr. J. E. Pope, who at the present time is making a great fight for old-age security legislation and has many friends in Congress who are with him despite any opposition to his efforts. Good night.

RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

STARKE, Fla., January 22, 1934.

HON. HENRY T. RAINEY,

Speaker House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as Chairman of the Committee on the Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

Very respectfully yours,

R. A. GREEN,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

MR. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 23, 1934, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(Tuesday, Jan. 23, 10:30 a.m.)

Hearing on H.R. 6604.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH, HOSPITALS, AND CHARITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Tuesday, Jan. 23, 10:30 a.m.)

S. 1780, alley closing.

H.R. 1578, H.R. 4548, H.R. 5590, old-age pensions.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

302. A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the report of the Federal Coordinator of Transportation on the question: "Is there need for a radical or major change in the organization, conduct, and regulation of the railroad industry which can be accomplished by Federal legislation?"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

303. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations pertaining to the legislative establishment, House of Representatives, in the sum of \$3,250 (H.Doc. No. 222); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. AYRES of Kansas: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 7199. A bill making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 335). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES of Kansas: A bill (H.R. 7199) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. McREYNOLDS: A bill (H.R. 7200) to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Chickamauga and Chattanooga Military Park in the States of Tennessee and Georgia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request): A bill (H.R. 7201) to amend Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government", enacted March 20, 1933, to continue retirement pay to certain emergency officers disabled in line of duty during the World War; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. CONNERY: A bill (H.R. 7202) to provide a 30-hour week for industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BERLIN (by request): A bill (H.R. 7203) to amend Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government", and Public Law No. 78, Seventy-third Congress, entitled "An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio: A bill (H.R. 7204) granting pensions and increases of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and nurses of the War with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or the China relief expedition, and their widows and dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H.R. 7205) to provide for the care and transportation of seamen from shipwrecked fishing and whaling vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H.R. 7206) to amend the Federal Kidnaping Act approved June 22, 1932; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SWANK: A bill (H.R. 7207) to protect labor, granting assistance to old and disabled persons, for the payment of old-age pensions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mrs. NORTON: A bill (H.R. 7208) to amend the act entitled "An act to require the erection of fire escapes in certain buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; approved March 19, 1906 (34 Stat. 70), as amended by the act of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1247); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOEPEL: A bill (H.R. 7209) to provide for citizenship to persons born in the United States who have not acquired any other nationality by personal affirmative act, but who have heretofore lost their United States citizenship through the naturalization of a parent under the laws of a foreign country, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BLACK: A bill (H.R. 7210) to license barbers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOPE: A bill (H.R. 7211) to amend Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, entitled "An act to maintain

the credit of the United States Government", and Public Law No. 78, Seventy-third Congress, entitled "An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MUSSELWHITE: A bill (H.R. 7212) to remove the limitation upon the extension of star routes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BURCH: A bill (H.R. 7213) to provide hourly rates of pay for substitute laborers in the railway mail service and time credits when appointed as regular laborer; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia: A bill (H.R. 7214) to provide the same penalties for assaults upon custodians of Government money or property as are now provided for assaults upon the custodians of mail matter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GASQUE: A bill (H.R. 7215) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Darlington, S.C., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Pee Dee River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H.R. 7216) to establish the Federal monetary authority, and to control the currency of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request): A bill (H.R. 7217) to amend an act entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government", approved March 20, 1933 (Public, No. 2, 73d Cong.), and an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes", approved June 16, 1933 (Public, No. 78, 73d Cong.); to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: A bill (H.R. 7218) to regulate the value of money in accordance with article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States, to reestablish the gold standard, to provide for its maintenance and stabilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIMPSON: Resolution (H.Res. 232) authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate the special, unwarranted, and unusual privileges and liberties accorded Federal prisoners at Federal penitentiaries; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHOEMAKER: Resolution (H.Res. 233) to investigate the official conduct of Joseph W. Molyneux, a United States district judge for the district of Minnesota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing Congress to establish uniform rules and regulations for the movement of all commodities in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the Congress to aid and assist industry, and particularly the small business man; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing Congress for a grant of lands for public buildings at the capital of the State in addition to grants heretofore made for that purpose; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H.R. 7219) granting a pension to Evaline Sammons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia: A bill (H.R. 7220) for the relief of Mrs. Charles L. Reed; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. KAHN: A bill (H.R. 7221) for the relief of Theodore Reynders; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 7222) for the relief of Augustus Marcel, alias Thomas Burns; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 7223) for the relief of A. R. Fourmont; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H.R. 7224) granting a pension to Guy G. LeMoyné; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 7225) to extend the benefits of the Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, to Thomas P. McGinn, a former employee of the United States Mint at San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H.R. 7226) to extend the benefits of the Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, to John F. Considine, a former employee of the United States under the Reclamation Service, Department of the Interior, at Yuma, Ariz.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H.R. 7227) for the relief of Walter Wiess; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 7228) for the relief of Ronald Stern; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'MALLEY: A bill (H.R. 7229) for the relief of the estate of Victor L. Berger, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMSPECK: A bill (H.R. 7230) for the relief of J. B. Hudson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H.R. 7231) for the relief of James Fred Richards; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H.R. 7232) for the relief of James H. Bell (or James Bell); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMASON: A bill (H.R. 7233) for the relief of Douglas C. Pyle; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H.R. 7234) for the relief of Kendrick Welles Diller; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1710. By Mr. BUCKBEE: Petition of Francis S. Klug, city clerk, and City Council of Peru, Ill., asking for continuance of the Civil Works Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1711. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of A. T. Baggett, Jr., president of chamber of commerce, Midlothian, Tex., urging that the Civil Works program be continued; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1712. Also, petition of Wiley J. Flint, adjutant of Nowlin Post, No. 124, American Legion, Mexia, Tex., favoring the four-point bill in behalf of World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1713. By Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota: Resolution by the Stony Run local of the Farmer's Union opposing the proposed 4½-cent tax on wool to be levied by the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1714. Also, petition opposing transfer of Coast Guard Service from the Treasury Department to the Navy Department, by the Board of County Commissioners of Lake County, Minn.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1715. Also, resolution by the county of Lake, Minn., requesting the payments of acreage taxes on Federal- and State-owned lands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1716. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petitions of Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the Friendship Class of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of Everest, Kans., urging the passage of House bill 6097, providing for higher moral standards for films entering interstate and international commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1717. Also, petitions of the Central Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Topeka, Kans.; the Hope Woman's

Christian Temperance Union, of Leavenworth, Kans.; and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Hiawatha, Kans., urging the passage of House bill 6097, providing for higher moral standards for films entering interstate and international commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1718. Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the Presbyterian Ladies' Aid, the Burden Bearers' Sunday School Class, the Willing Workers' Sunday School Class, and the Young Mothers' Sunday School Class of the Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, all of Mahaska, Kans., urging the passage of House bill 6097, providing higher moral standards for films entering interstate and international commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1719. Also, letter of the First Baptist Church, of Kansas City, Kans., urging the support of all antilynching bills pending before the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1720. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Associated Industries of New York State, Inc., Buffalo, N.Y., urging a qualified congressional committee to report upon employment relations in industry and commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1721. Also, petition of Columbia Typographical Union, No. 101, Washington, D.C., opposing continuation of Government pay cut as provided in the independent offices appropriation bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1722. Also, petition of the Liquid Carbonic Corporation, Buffalo, N.Y., concerning elimination of tax on carbon gas used for carbonating beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1723. By Mr. LUCE: Resolutions adopted by Society of Master Painters and Decorators of Massachusetts, Inc., regarding rate of wages paid by Civil Works Administration and Public Works Administration; to the Committee on Labor.

1724. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of Associated Industries of New York State, Inc., Buffalo, N.Y., favoring the authorization of a qualified congressional committee to report on the facts as to the nature of employment relations in industry and commerce, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1725. Also, petition of the Liquid Carbonic Corporation, Buffalo, N.Y., favoring the elimination of the tax on carbonic gas used for carbonating beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1726. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Memorial by the Rotary Club of Long Branch, Long Branch, N.J., favoring enactment of Senate bill 1944 as specified in attached resolution; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1727. Also, memorial by the Veterinary Medical Association of New Jersey, approving the proposed revision of the Pure Food and Drug Act of 1906; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1728. By Mr. TERRY of Arkansas: Resolution of Arkansas State Senate calling for Federal aid for educational system of State, to assist school children in gaining adequate education in this time of depression; to the Committee on Education.

1729. By Mr. TURNER: Petition of numerous citizens of Franklin, Tenn., protesting against the passage of bill infringing on the rights of citizens to own and possess firearms; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1730. Also, resolution from Railroad Employees Pension Association, Chapter 98, favoring the passage of Hatfield-Keller bill, Senate bill 817 and House bill 4231; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1731. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Palihan ng Bayan touching upon the political relation between the United States and the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1732. Also, petition of the city of Wauwatosa, Wis., regarding the continuation of the Civil Works Administration; to the Committee on Ways and Means.